

THE ORIGINS OF THE ANIMAL STYLE IN

ENGLISH ROMANESQUE ART

by

CAROLA BROWN

Thesis presented for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
University of Edinburgh

Autumn 1967



".... a considerable number of tympana bear figures of greater or less crudity, to which it would be idle to assign more significance than the whim of the carver"

A.W. Clapham, English Romanesque Architecture
vol. II, After the Conquest (1934) 138

LIST OF CONTENTS

VOLUME I

	<u>Introduction</u>	I - 21
	Art History and Archaeology	I - II
	The Aims of the Thesis	II - 21
<u>Section I:</u>	<u>Anglo-Norman Animal Sculpture</u>	22 - 166
	1. Catalogue of Sculpture	22 - 134
	2. Chronology	135 - 160
	3. The Anglo-Norman Animal Style	161-166
<u>Section II:</u>	<u>Pre-Conquest Animal Sculpture</u>	167-208
	A. Ireland	168 - 176
	B. Scotland	177 - 190
	C. Isle of Man	191 - 199
	D. Viking England	200 - 207
	Summary	208
<u>Section III:</u>	<u>The Animal Ornament of the Bayeux Tapestry</u>	209 - 254
	A. The Confronted Pairs	212 - 225
	B. The Narrative Scenes	225 - 238
	C. The Origins of the Borders	238 - 253
	Summary	254 203
<u>Section IV:</u>	<u>The Survival of the Iranian Animal Style</u>	255 - 306
	A. The Sassanian Animal Style	255 - 281
	B. The Effect on Anglo-Norman Art	281-304*
	Summary	305
	<u>Conclusions</u>	307-310

VOLUME II

Notes on Sections I - IV

Appendices:

- A. Views on the Chronology and Origins of the Manx Style
- B. Reasons for dating the Tapestry to 1077
- C. Herrmann's Interpretation of the Tapestry Fables

Bibliography

Plates I - 54

Figures I - 9 and Tapestry Borders

Supplement. Spring 1968.

LIST OF PLATES

- | | |
|-----------|------------------|
| I. | Ideford |
| 2,3. | Durham |
| 4,5. | Ampney St. Mary |
| 6. | Beckford |
| 7. | Dumbleton |
| 8,9. | North Cerny |
| 10,11. | Alton |
| 12. | Whippingham |
| 13. | Kenninghall |
| 14. | Southwell |
| 15. | Clifton Hamden |
| 16. | Fritwell |
| 17. | Kencott |
| 18. | Newton Purcell |
| 19. | Salford |
| 20. | Egletton |
| 21. | Milborne Port |
| 22. | Stogursey |
| 23. | Stoke-sub-Hamden |
| 24. | Kingswinford |
| 25. | Jevington |
| 26, 27. | Peasmarsh |
| 28. | Knook |
| 29,30,31. | Little Langford |

- 32. Elmley Castle
- 33. Netherton
- 34,35. Old Byland
- 36. Sinnington
- 37. Aldbrough-in-Holderness
- 38. Kells, Cross of Sts. Patrick and Columba
- 39. Kells, Market Cross
- 40. Clonmacnoise, Fragment
- 41. Kells, Market Cross
- 42. Clonmacnoise, Fragment
- 43. Tuam
- 44. ~~Kells~~ Clonmacnoise, Nun's Church
- 45. St. Paul's Churchyard Stone
- 46. Tak-I-Bostan
- 47-50. Vladimir Suzdal Churches
- 51,52. Terracina Casket
- 53. Stara Zagora
- 54. Egyptian textile (V & A 245-1890)

LIST OF FIGURES

- I a. Kensworth
- b. Chester
- c. Great Salkeld
- 2 a. Kedleston
- b. Stanton-by-Bridge
- c. Whitwell
- d. Swarkestone
- e. Darley Dale
- 3 a. Cricklade
- b. Everton
- c. Tutbury Priory
- d. Barnetby-le-Wold
- 4 a. Kells, Cross of Patrick and Columba
- b. Castledermot
- c. Kells, Market Cross
- 5 a. Kells, Market Cross
- b. Aberlemno
- c. Camuston
- d. Tihilly
- e. Newton Woods
- f. Inchinnan
- g. Farr
- h. Kildalton
- i. Meigle
- j. Gask
- 6 a. Michael 105
- b. Maughold 66
- c. Michael ~~105~~ 72
- d. Andreas 102
- 7 a. Maughold 65
- b. Gask
- c. Michael 105
- d. Meigle 12
- e. Bride 97
- f. Shandwick
- g. Michael 105
- h. Kirriemuir
- 8 a. Tjüngvide
- b. Aldbar
- c. Great Clifton
- d. Dacre
- e. Gosforth
- f. Gallehus

- 9 a. S. Domingo de Silos, MS. 30,845 f.136 b.
b. S. Baudelio de Berlanga (wall painting)
c. Facundas Beatus 1047 f.197
d. 2 " " " f. 6

Bayeux Tapestry:

A I - 240 Upper border

B I - 205 Lower border

C I - 4 Central panel motifs

ANGLO-NORMAN ANIMAL CARVINGS IN THE CATALOGUE

Kensworth,	Beds.
Dinton,	Bucks.
Lathbury,	
Leckhampstead	
Cambridge, (St. Bene't's)	Cambs.
Ely	
Acton,	Cheshire
Chester, (St. Johns)	
Egloskerry,	Cornwall
Treneglos,	
Grasmere,	Cumberland
Great Salkeld,	
St. Bee's	
Ashford,	Derby
Ault Hucknall,	
Darley Dale,	
Hognaston,	
Parwich,	
Kedleston,	
Shirley,	
Stanton-by-Bridge,	
Swarkestone,	
Whitwell,	
Bondleigh,	Devon
Ideford,	
Wynford Eagle,	Dorset
Castle Chapel,	Durham
Ampney St. Mary,	Gloucester.
Beckford,	
Dumbleton,	
Harnhill,	
Lower Swell,	
Moreton Valence,	
North Cerney,	
Stratton,	
Alton,	Hants.
Whippingham,	
Covington,	Hunts.
Little Paxton,	
Stow Longa,	

Sandwich,	Kent.
Hallaton,	Leics.
Stoney Stanton,	
Barnetby-le-Wold,	Lincs.
Little Bytham,	
Kenninghall,	Norfolk
Barton Segrave,	Northants.
Northampton, (St.Sepulchre's)	
Ulgham,	Northumberland
Everton,	Notts.
Hoveringham,	
Southwell,	
Clifton Hamden,	Oxon.
Fritwell,	
Kencott,	
Newton Purcell,	
Salford,	
Llanbadarn Fawr,	Radnor
Egleton,	Rutland
Ridlington	
Much Wenlock,	Shropshire,
Stottesdon,	
Uppington,	
Wroxeter,	
Flax Bourton,	Somerset
Milborne Port,	
Stogursey,	
Stoke-sub-Hamden,	
Ipstones,	Staffs.
Kingswinford,	
Tutbury Priory,	
Ipswich (St.Nicholas)	Suffolk
Santon Downham,	
Wordwell,	
Bramber,	Sussex
Jevington,	
Peasmarsch,	
Selham,	
Alveston,	Warwick,

Long Marton,

Westmorland

Cricklade,
Knook,
Little Langford,
Netheravon,

Wilts.

Elmley Castle,
Netherton,
Ribbesford,
Stockton,

Worcester.

Alne,
Hilton,
Leake,
Newton in Cleveland
Old BYland,
Sinnington,

Yorkshire, N. Riding

Emley,

W. Riding

Aldbrough in Holderness,
Fridaythorpe,

E. Riding

INTRODUCTION:ART HISTORY AND ARCHAEOLOGY

The relationship between art history and archaeology is not always a compatible one. The archaeologist accuses the art historian of a negligent attitude to chronology, of the definition of styles and phases for reasons of personal criticism, and of a tendency to invest the style with a humanity of its own at the expense of the human factor behind it. The art historian on the other hand finds stylistic development a more reliable guide to an artistic sequence than the dates of the fallible archaeologist, and would prefer to study an object by the principles of criticism rather than the typological study of its function. The conflict arises from the fact that archaeologist and art historian can study the same material evidence - as opposed to the documents of the historian - in order to reach conclusions quite different in nature: concerning styles and concerning cultures. But the fact that it is the same evidence should make it possible for the two to assist each other, for the conclusions drawn as a result of the application of the principles of one side to be of some benefit to the other. The subject is basically the same, the study of man's past through his material remains; but a gulf lies between the ecological and the artistic past, not helped by the view that it is art which distinguishes man from the higher apes. War and trade have just as much significance if not such nobility;

but the evidence for these activities is of a different type. An object more elaborately decorated than its fellow may be taken and studied out of context while the archaeologist, aware of the working of principles which he does not appreciate, is sometimes too ready to overlook the archaeological significance of ornament on the grounds of its aesthetic import.

The borderline between history and prehistory could well be extended to distinguish between signed and anonymous works of art, forming a kind of art prehistory. For while it is a relatively straightforward task to discuss the development of an artist who has thoughtfully signed and dated his works, the attribution of anonymous pieces can never be known to be accurate. The knowledge that there is an absolute date and an individual artist sometimes seems to act as a kind of spur to the art historian: the facts are only temporarily concealed from him, and if he makes enough comparisons, they will miraculously be revealed. Certainly it is mainly by making comparisons that these works can be studied; to have several examples of a type informs one rather more about the type than the individual examples, which can however be considered as representatives of the group. But the odiousness of comparisons is that they are so frequently entirely personal and subjective. Many different conclusions can be reached about one object, on the grounds of its style; and while none of its critics believe that they are wrong, they cannot all be right.

To consider the attitude to chronology: when an object is

not actually marked with the year of its manufacture, then it is impossible to state definitely that it was made in a particular year. Sometimes it may be possible, given enough evidence, to suggest that it was most probably made in such a year; it is the assumption of certainty that is wrong. But it is all too easy to use a number of assumptions to build up a whole scheme of chronology which may be completely false. When chronology cannot be absolute it must be relative. Yet the study of art is, by its nature, concerned rather with the merits of individual objects than their significance as a group, while, to build up a reliable system of relative chronology, the group must be studied as a whole so that individual variants can be used as some guide to development; and only when the proper sequence is established can some cross-reference be used for considering single examples.

There are two main methods of external dating in art prehistory, by association and by comparison. The former lies in considering the object in the context in which it is found, by its setting, by the objects found with it, through which it is often possible to find *termini post or ante quem* for its use and manufacture. This is a more detached method, depending on facts rather than opinions, than the latter, dating by comparison. The object is considered in this case on its artistic merit - that is, according to the standards of the art historian who is studying it - and then it is compared with other examples of similar style, and if a close enough connection can be recognised, data about the other examples can be applied to the first. If 'style' was

something which could be measured in concrete terms like weight or height, then this means of dating might work, but it is not; and it is too often based upon the personal views of the critic, with disregard of the few facts that are available.

To determine the date of an object in preference to considering its artistic merit might seem narrow minded and unduly academic, but it is at least dealing with facts instead of confusing the issue by stating unprovable theories as established conclusions. To say, without confirmation, that C is a later version of B, and that in A, one can see B traits developing is a waste of time; in another critic's opinion, the order could be quite validly reversed. Not until one can put A, B and C in a correctly dated sequence is there any point in discussing their stylistic development. But once dated, an object is of more value in itself, for only then can the significance of its traits be appreciated; and as parts of a group, for then it becomes possible to consider the development of a style, and even regional variants, which can suggest information about its spread and possible origin. Naturally, examples can rarely be as clear cut as this, but the objects studied by the art prehistorian - ivory, sculpture, pottery, metalwork - while they do not have a date stamped on them, should provide typological evidence enough to assign them to the right place in their sequence; and they should not be taken out of context on the grounds of being on a

higher plane but should be considered as a type which has also received decoration. It is not the decoration which places the object in its sequence as being developed or early, but the typological place of the object in its group that then determines the stage of development reached in the decoration. This is not a principle which can always be applied, but is valid in dealing with the items studied by both archaeologist and art historian. Only when they have been placed against the right background, by reason of chronology and function, is it permissible to make artistic pronouncements about such objects, if one must do this.

This definition of styles and phases for reasons of personal criticism is barely valid, even when more factual evidence is lacking. But it is sometimes used instead of and in preference to such evidence. In 1951, in an article re-assigning some examples of disputedly pre-Conquest sculpture, A.W. Clapham felt confident enough to write: "the general bases upon which this revision rests are stylistic appreciation of the sculptures themselves and comparison with continental material; it is only, as it were, by accident that factual evidence is admitted into the discussion, if indeed its intrusion is considered to be at all relevant". But this sort of approach results in the acceptance of one man's stylistic appreciation and hypothetical parallels with continental material as factual evidence of a far more weighty

kind than the limited amount which can be looked for - the documentary and constructional history of the church into which such sculptures are built is dismissed out of hand. How can any stylistic appreciation be accepted which does not rest upon facts? The role of the art historian is surely to define and discuss styles in relation to the dates involved, to trace the consequent stylistic traits which can be seen to develop, and to relate these to their historical and cultural background. But to be influenced by one's own tastes to the extent of defining the quality of a work and using that as the basis on which to establish a whole theory is a process which, almost more than anything else, has led to the establishment of platitudes in place of artistic criticism. For example, an earlier generation who preferred Saxon figural sculpture to the Norman use of geometric and animal ornament were not content to leave it at that, but had to describe the Norman style as crude, primitive and barbarous, concluding that the Norman Conquest meant a drastic decline in the standards of English art. This reasoning is suspect itself; and it led to the even faultier attribution of any late eleventh century piece of agreed merit, as 'pre-Conquest'. This helps to account for much of the confusion in early English Romanesque studies today.

Another point of disagreement between archaeologist and art historian is the latter's tendency to humanise the style, in that it is frequently regarded as 'travelling' over

continents, or 'reviving' after centuries, ignoring the more archaeological factors of trade or migration. There can be an invention of new so-called styles, where these do not necessarily exist, like the archaeological habit of defining new cultures on what may be no more than a difference in pottery decoration; and they are often more real to the art historian than they would have been to the artist. A style is nothing in itself. It might be the manner in which a group of artists are working at the same time in a similar part of the country on a particular type of material, but these are not necessary criteria. A more important factor in determining the parallels between various decorated objects - and those with the greatest number of parallels may be said to be in the same style - is the background of the artist: those working under the same influences will have most in common; and the closer the resemblance, the more identical a background may be assumed. There is a danger in trying to spot the handiwork of individual artists by studying the apparent variations within a style; for the whole style is composed of variations, the work of a series of artists working independently but sharing common sources.

If two objects, which may be considerably separated in time and space, resemble one another closely, there is a choice of at least two conclusions: common origin or direct influence. The theory of common origin is the only way of accounting for

similarities in the work of artists who could not possibly have been in contact with one another. The resemblance between a bird carved on an Irish cross and on the facade of Achtamar does not mean that the Irish sculptor has visited Armenia, or vice versa; but it is possible that both are being influenced by a common prototype. If the parallels are very close, then it is likely that the source of influence is a fairly recent one, if there are also differences, then there may have been some time lag and consequent development of divergent traits. And if Irish and Armenian artists have been using the same models, it must be something which is likely to have been brought to each country - and it is therefore unrealistic to hypothesise Persian wall paintings, whose sphere of influence would be limited to those who had actually seen them in situ. But textiles or manuscripts making use of Persian motifs, the sort of things which in the economic and social context of the times were likely, and were in fact known to have travelled and, most important, on which similar birds were seen - this is the kind of factual evidence that must be taken into account.

The object, the style should always be considered as a reflexion of these processes. In the same way, the recurrence of traits is too often described as a case of deliberate revival, when in fact it is the influencing factors, the external sources and contacts which happen to recur, producing the same circumstances which had resulted in a similar style

of art in an earlier period. It is not really in the nature of the artist to force himself into a deliberate copy of old modes - or if this happens, the result is self conscious and remains contemporary with the artist. Styles do not spontaneously revive; but influences frequently recur.

As a part of the same belief in styles in their own right, the cyclic view of history is too often applied to the study of art. This is the habit of considering style sequences in terms of early, middle and late, Archaic, Mature and Baroque. While this is sometimes relevant, it is not true of all styles, and sometimes leads to the neglect of factors, because they do not fit into the pattern, which would otherwise disprove it. In Greek art, for example, one is taught that the rigidity of the statues of the archaic period is a result of the early, primitive phase of art that it was; but a study of the motifs on the painted pottery at the same date shows the very strong oriental influences that were present, and which were being adapted by the Greeks into their own style of art with considerable effect on sculpture. But until fairly recent times statues were art while pottery was archaeology; it is a combination of the disciplines that results in periods being studied in their own right and not as parts of a preconceived scheme.

From the end of the eighteenth century, the Gothic style began to be recognised as something more than the barbaric

period before the classical renaissance, and its importance caused the Romanesque to be regarded as nothing more than the primitive, Archaic phase of Gothic art. Now Romanesque art has been more than adequately recognised in its own right, and attention has been turned to the pre-Romanesque period, the Dark Ages. These are no longer considered a yawning gulf in the era before Cluny and the pilgrimage routes in which an occasional Romanesque-foreshadowing trait could be swooped on and dragged hawk-like out of context; as a result of the study of what seems more like archaeological than artistic evidence, the art of this period is beginning to receive the recognition which it deserves. The Vikings, Merovingians, Celts and Anglo-Saxons have been first of all considered in archaeological terms - their art has on the whole been found by excavation rather than preservation, and accordingly taken in relation to its background: the type of object it ornaments, and the conditions of the find. Only then has the aesthetic point of view been taken into account, and it is fair to say that the art of the Dark Ages is seen in a much better perspective, that the use of ornament is seen as an integral and functional part of the cultures involved.

As a result, the pre-Romanesque period falls into no kind of cyclic pattern of art. Traits which are seen more fully developed in Romanesque art are there, associated with belated versions of classical art; the stream of eastern influence continues as energetically as it has done over the previous millennium, while local elements going back to

prehistoric times still survive. These are the basic styles at issue in the Dark Ages. Then there is the influence of social and geographic factors, the development of nationality among the groups of peoples at this period, so that one can speak in terms of Germanic, Irish, Scandinavian styles. The third current comes from the historical background, bringing further complexity - the effect of the migrations and nomadic invasions, the spread of Christianity from the east Mediterranean, the mobility of the Vikings. And finally, as a kind of fourth dimension, is the type of ornament involved: the human figure, plant, geometric, abstract or animal forms.

Such complexity is not exclusive to the Dark Ages, but this period, studied through the combination of documentary and archaeological evidence, has very rich sources; and the wealth of evidence in what is still a time of obscurity means that many fields remain to be examined, and problems to be solved in the art of the pre-Romanesque era, both for their own sake and for the light they throw on Romanesque art, the first European style.

The Aims of the Thesis

This thesis attempts to relate art history and archaeology by studying one aspect of one of the many styles involved with a strict emphasis on chronology and none at all on its

significance as good or bad art. In accordance with the principles boldly stated above, a group of carvings will be considered in a sequence based on chronological rather than stylistic grounds, and related to the complex background of styles and influences, local and foreign, which might have contributed to their origin; while a specific study of certain motifs seeks to show the great variety of sources that contributed towards the development of Romanesque art. This illustrates the combination of factors discussed above - the various styles involved, the geographical and historical impulses and the decoration itself, the use of animal ornament. The animal form in art is of such frequency and antiquity that its true significance is not immediately apparent; but it is also hoped to show that the animal style of ornament in the Anglo-Norman period is rather more than the Anglo-Norman animal style as such, that it in fact represents a belated, western, Christianised version of the Iranian animal style.

Towards these ends, the thesis is divided into four sections:

- 1) Anglo-Norman animal sculpture
- 2) Pre-Conquest animal sculpture in the British Isles
- 3) The animal style of the Bayeux Tapestry
- 4) The survival of the Iranian animal style

While there are obvious dangers in concentrating upon only one type of ornament, it is hoped that the conclusions drawn from this narrow study are applicable to English Romanesque art in the wider sense; by studying the animal ornament, a

sequence of development from the first years after the Conquest into the early twelfth century and the full English Romanesque can be shown, with the survival and incorporation of much earlier traits blending early Christian, Scandinavian and even Celtic elements combined with the new impulses from the east which were also felt in the rest of Europe; while the Tapestry is seen to be neither Anglo-Saxon nor Romanesque, but a typically Anglo-Norman work.

1) Anglo-Norman animal sculpture

In England after the Norman Conquest the use of animal motifs became characteristic of the sculptured decoration of churches, mainly on tympana and capitals. It is possible to define an early group which tends to be superseded, after the first quarter of the twelfth century, by the development of regional schools and a richer iconography bringing a new unity and maturity of style. While no single date can ever be regarded as a satisfactory border line, in general terms the years before 1120 show the growth of an architectural sculpture using animal ornament as its main subject. Nor can 1066 be regarded as absolute, since Norman influences were certainly felt before this date, but it does serve to mark the beginning of the real Anglo-Norman period. 1066 to 1120 spans almost two generations, time indeed for a style to develop. By dating the churches where the sculptures occur, when this can be done, it is possible to show a clear sequence of

development from the extremely simple types immediately following the Conquest to the more complex treatment of the early twelfth century which leads into the elaborate fully Romanesque schools of carving.

Another way of grouping the animal carvings of this period is possible, and that is one which shows the different influences which were felt. Particular stress is laid upon other examples of stone carving rather than animal motifs in different media such as manuscripts or metalwork, for stone sculpture is not portable and represents a more delayed and local version of a style: while ornament is copied from various sources in the Anglo-Norman period the architectural nature of the carving meant that much adaptation was needed, while the construction of the building would also involve some time lag. As many of these works are small scale affairs - tiny parish churches rather than cathedrals and abbeys - there is likely to be a considerable effect from underlying local traditions. This is combined in varying degrees with the 'Romanesque' factor of the function of sculptural decoration and its different range of motifs, so that in the years before 1120 it is still possible to trace the interaction of old and new influences in animal sculpture before a kind of balance was reached. 1120 in no way marks the end of this period of transition, since in many remote districts the new elements took a long time to penetrate, and primitive looking works can date from

quite late in the twelfth century while, conversely, several advanced, developed looking examples can come quite soon after the Conquest. For these reasons, 1120 could be regarded as of stylistic rather than chronological significance, marking the end of the period of overlap in which elements of pre-Conquest art can be seen working themselves out while the new Romanesque traits are being adapted.

2) Pre-Conquest animal sculpture in the British Isles

The already existing styles of sculpture in Britain are of importance in considering the origins of the Anglo-Norman animal style; for the local sculptors of the late eleventh century are more likely to have been influenced by the styles they had been trained in and which they could have seen around them. And despite working in a newly imported system of decoration and iconography, it was inevitable that they should retain earlier elements. By the eleventh century, there was a bewilderingly rich complex of sculptural styles in Britain, in which animal ornament played a major role, reflecting aspects of her history over the previous centuries; the Anglo-Norman group has certain parallels with the pre-Conquest animal sculpture of Ireland, Scotland, Man and north England.

A most important factor is the Scandinavian settlement of Britain; for by the Viking invasion and occupation of these areas, styles were copied, adapted and misunderstood by this

common denominator, so that many elements were held in common while local and distinctive differences could yet be seen. The origins of the animal element in each group arise out of the varying combinations of the styles of east Mediterranean Christianity, the art of the Germanic peoples and a survival of the Celtic Iron Age - whichever factors had been of most influence in that area. The most recurrent motifs in each group can be interestingly compared with those which are most held in common. The development of the animal style in Scandinavia is also significant, fraught with disagreements on the relative importance of Irish or English influence upon it, or whether its growth was spontaneous and local, the insular parallels representing merely a later phase; the Danish occupation of England in the early eleventh century should also be remembered, and it is these factors which combine to produce the examples of the Scandinavian animal style in the Anglo-Norman period. They are unmistakably alien, showing evidence of the powerful tradition behind them, and do not adapt so successfully into the Anglo-Norman style as do the other underlying local elements which can be traced.

There is less animal sculpture in the south of England in the pre-Conquest period, resulting perhaps from the more classical influences in Anglo-Saxon sculpture, laying greater stress on the human figure; a certain amount of Viking influence is seen, as in the Wessex group of carvings, but there are no very

close parallels with the Anglo-Norman animal style. Motifs of the northern group, however, incorporated into the early English Romanesque, even spread back from the British Isles into Normandy, Germany and Scandinavia, and survive side by side with elements deriving from the much wider background of continental Romanesque art.

3) The animal style of the Bayeux Tapestry

The Bayeux Tapestry, through its animal ornamented borders, is an important source of reference for the Anglo-Norman animal style, because it can be fairly accurately dated. The two borders are as significant for the art of the period as the central narrative strip, and a detailed study of their animal motifs throws light on the Tapestry itself and on the sources available for animal ornament, whose conclusions can also be applied to the sculpture group. The Tapestry ornament is no isolated phenomenon but finds many comparisons with the sculpture style in the use and choice of animals and the way in which they are shown: this suggests that they had many sources in common. The difference between them lies in the fact that the Tapestry animals lack the pre-Conquest, Nordic background which does contribute to the sculpture group; which suggests that despite the many Anglo-Saxon elements which are present in the Tapestry, the designer might have been a Norman, who, although trained in the Anglo-Saxon manuscript

style which was common in Normandy in the late eleventh century, was not aware of the local animal styles of pre-Conquest Britain.

The border animals fall into three main types: those depicting Aesop's fables, perhaps copied from an illustrated manuscript; certain ornamental motifs common in sculpture, ivory, metalwork and manuscript art, a part of the general Romanesque repertoire; and the confronted pairs which form by far the greatest proportion of the border ornament. Although the use of heraldic symmetry is characteristic of the period, the Tapestry shows its source of origin; for this treatment of animal forms is most characteristic of woven textiles, where the setting up of the loom causes the mirror image of the animal. The fact that the Tapestry animals are hand embroidered, and therefore do not need this faithful symmetry shows the strength of the textile tradition. Persian textiles are frequently cited as a source for Romanesque ornament: the Tapestry borders provide vivid proof of this.

4) The survival of the Iranian animal style

The homeland of the animal style reflected in these woven silks, tapestries and hangings is Iran. Its spread and survival can be traced through the history of the peoples associated with the area who became influenced by the ancient Iranian animal art, and adapted it into their own styles. In this way it is possible to consider the unity of the 'Animal Style' for certain elements remain constant despite

the differing treatment they receive. These elements are seen in the selection and positioning of the animals used. In certain areas where contacts are direct and frequent, the style is sometimes adopted without modification: for example, it is not easy to distinguish Byzantine from Persian textiles on the basis of their animal ornament, while some Armenian sculptured facade motifs closely resemble their Sassanian prototypes. Greater differences arise when the area under influence already has a local animal tradition in art: sporadic Sassanian elements have been tentatively recognised in Pictish art, but these are few compared with survivals of the Iron Age animal style - itself however ultimately descended from Eurasiatic art - while in Scandinavia, the Persian elements apparent in creatures like the Jellinge lion are quickly swallowed up in the linear interlacing treatment of animals that was characteristic of Nordic art. While 'Sassanian' applies to the art of that dynasty, 'Persian' can be used more generally to cover the continuity of styles in Sassanian and early Islamic work; 'Iranian' is applied to the pre-Sassanian period.

The particular importance of Persian textiles is that they are known, through both documentary and archaeological evidence, to have been brought to west Europe. Christianity is the main factor: the costly woven silks, made familiar through pilgrimages to the east, were in demand to wrap relics and ornament churches as hangings and vestments, and a great

textile trade gradually developed after the migration period. The animal ornament of these textiles, originating in remote Iranian art, was copied in the west, serving as models for craftsmen in other media; and in the Romanesque period became a characteristic element in the carved architectural decoration that marked the period.

As for the Anglo-Norman animal style, while it is possible to distinguish the immediate local, pre-Conquest sources, many of which themselves have an eastern origin, there are also more direct Persian elements. Parallels in other Romanesque sculptures suggest that the common source is textile ornament; the Bayeux Tapestry is an example of a textile made in the west copying the eastern prototypes which it shares with so many other examples of Romanesque animal art.

By dividing the thesis into these four sections, it is hoped to be able to define and discuss the development of the Anglo-Norman animal sculpture style, and to trace its origins. These arise out of a combination of the multiple animal styles of the British Isles in the pre-Conquest period with the Romanesque style which was brought as a result of the Conquest; the Iranian influence on it, arising mainly from the ornament of Persian textiles, is the most important factor in the animal style, and the strength of this tradition is shown in the borders of the Bayeux Tapestry, which represents the

Anglo-Norman version of the Iranian animal style, and have many points in common with the animals of the sculpture group.

SECTION 1

ANGLO-NORMAN ANIMAL SCULPTURE

The following catalogue of examples of Anglo-Norman architectural sculpture using animal ornament is listed alphabetically, under the counties they occur in. Detailed evidence for dating the churches, when this occurs, publication references and opinions on the style are discussed in notes at the end of the thesis. After the catalogue the establishment of a chronology will be considered, from which stylistic conclusions can be drawn; and the content and development of the Anglo-Norman animal style will be discussed. The symbolism, wider stylistic affinities and origins are considered in Sections II to IV.

1. Catalogue of Sculptures

St. Mary's, Kensworth, Beds. (1) Fig. 1a. Parts of the present building date from the mid twelfth century, but there are foundations of an earlier church with which the rebuilt west and south doors can be related. Two faces of the west capital of the south door are carved each with a bird and an animal. On the south face they both turn to the right, the bird perched on the back of the animal, into whose upturned, large, open mouth it pokes its beak. The bird has one wing raised, the feathers indicated by parallel lines, and the wedge shaped tail has

similar markings. The animal is shown with the forelegs bent forward, swelling rather where they join the body, while the hind legs are quite straight; the tail bends down between the legs and up behind the back, where it ends in a snake like head. On the east face, the animal again faces to the left, with crouched forelegs and straight hind legs, but its head is turned backwards to bite at the leg of the bird, which stands on its back and faces the snake-headed tail. This bird has longer legs, ending in large three-toed claws, and a long thin neck and beak; the head is bent and leaning against the snake head of the animal's tail. The relief of the carving is very shallow and the surface is generally flat; there seem to be faint traces of some kind of engraved surface patterning.

On the southern impost of the west door is a similar bird with rounded head, thin beak, wing and wedge shaped tail with parallel lines to indicate the feathers; and on the fifth stone on the south side of the arch, whose other stones are carved with simple geometric patterns, are two pairs of confronted birds, one above the other, whose heads are turned back to bite at the wing.

St. Peter and St. Paul, Dinton, Bucks. (2) The south door belongs to the earliest phase of twelfth century building. The tympanum represents two dragons confronted before a tree with a wide, twisting trunk and realistic leaves; on

each side, half way up are suspended two round objects, presumably fruit, which are held in the mouths of the dragons. These have hound-like faces with two pricked ears, blunt ended jaws, and rather long muzzles, with double outlining. On the necks are patterns suggesting stylised manes. The two short legs of each reach forward to clutch at the trunk and roots of the tree, ending in distinct claws with one curved lower toe and three upper ones. The bodies lack wings, but are otherwise dragon-like in that they narrow into tails which loop up across the body, ending in lotus-shaped tips. There is a Latin inscription below, which translates: 'If anyone should despair of receiving rewards for his deserts, let him hear and apply himself to these precepts and deem it his duty ever to uphold them.' (3)

Below the tympanum is a carved lintel; on the right, a small human figure shown facing the front and holding sideways a cross pointed towards the long dragon which fills the rest of the lintel, the scene representing the combat of St. Michael with the dragon. The dragon is of a different type from the two above; it is extended horizontally, with a thick, heavy body and a large head. The jaws are open showing two rows of jagged teeth and a long protruding tongue which sticks up. The eye is large and bulging, set in the upper part of the forehead, and the two pointed ears, with double outlining, grow side by side, in contrast to the dragons above, where one ear is shown behind the other. Scalloped lines on the neck indicate the scaly

skin, and one wing, engraved with parallel lines, is shown raised and running parallel to the back. Two very short legs grow beneath the body, which runs broad and straight, and then loops right round itself, ending in an upturned tip, before which is a strange tufted protruberance.

Both carvings are done in a shallow relief with slightly moulded planes, and they show an accomplished adaptation to their settings. The upper design fits well into the semi-circular shape, the tree marking the highest point, and the dragons' tails being flattened into the corners; while the lintel carving forms a neat rectangle.

All Saints, Lathbury, Bucks (4). The church was rebuilt in the late twelfth century, when the much earlier carved tympanum was reset in the wall at the north east end of the south aisle. It represents two animals confronted before a central tree; on the right, a lion is seen in profile, with mouth wide open and tongue protruding to touch the trunk. The front far leg is raised to touch the trunk and the tail bends down between the hind legs and up behind the back, ending in a triple lobed tip. The mane is shown as two rows of long curls extending over the neck, and an elaborate foliage pattern forms a background. The animal on the left also has its front far paw raised to the tree, and its head is turned back to bite at a great loop, with central beading, which rises from under its body, and curves round behind

its head, which has wide jaws, almond shaped eye and one pricked ear. From behind its back another animal's head appears, which is biting at the turned neck. The body is long and thin, and the tail very short. The relief is flat and shallow.

The Assumption of the Virgin, Leckhampstead, Bucks (5). This is a church with several phases of building in the twelfth century; over the south door is a reset tympanum which appears to date from an early phase. It shows two dragons confronted before a small human figure which is trapped between their paws and beneath their jaws; it faces the front, having a head with human features indicated, but animal-like pricked ears and is wearing a garment with belt and trousers. The dragons have large heads, with open, fanged jaws and tongues which bend up, like that of the lintel dragon at Dinton, to touch each other, oval eyes, and large, outlined ears, growing side by side from the head. The wings jut abruptly from the back, the feathers indicated by parallel engraved lines with short diagonal striations. The body and tail of the dragon on the left has a central beaded spine, and it loops around to terminate in leaves and tendrils; the body of the other dragon tails off into similar lozenge shaped leaves and little spirals, while foliage is also shown above and below the bodies. The legs, which hang down to trap the small figure between them end in large curved claws. The relief is very shallow, but is carved with sloping planes and almost gives

the effect of wood carving; the whole surface of the stone is filled with decoration.

The style of the birds and animal mask on the capitals at either side of the doorway is quite different, and obviously later in date; the relief is deep, the surfaces smooth, while the dragon stone does not fit very well into the shape of the present tympanum.

St. Benet's, Cambridge, Cambs. (6) The west tower can be ascribed to the period of Saxo-Norman overlap. On the eastern face of the tower arch, above the imposts at either end of the hood mould are two carved felines, each facing inwards to the archway. They are shown with body in profile but head facing the front, the tails bending down between the hind legs and up behind the back. The faces are given wideset pricked ears, with triangular excisions in the centre, large round eyes, broad nose and apparently moustached mouth. While these features are moulded, the rest of the body surfaces are very flat; the relief, although not deep, stands clearly out from the background.

Ely Cathedral, Cambs. (7) The volute capitals of the south transept were most probably completed by 1093, and they are decorated with animal and foliage ornament. On one capital, the two adjacent faces are carved with confronted lions, a leafy motif on the angle face between them. They are each

seen in profile, the heads raised, with open mouths, pricked ears and large oval eyes; the manes are treated as three tongue shaped curls with slightly raised outlines. The front far legs are raised, while the shoulder joints of the near legs are clearly marked. The tail of the one on the right bends down between the legs, ending in a triple leaved tip, while that on the left continues up and over the back.

Another confronted pair within one face are two indeterminate animals which are reared up and appear to be fighting. Their front legs are crossed and they are biting each other's mouths. The muzzles are short, the ears small and pricked, and they are wearing collars. The bodies are stumpy in contrast to the very long legs, and they are shown with only one leg to represent each fore and hind pair. The tails are very long, curving up over the back, and extending into the very corner of the capital, ending in a leaf shaped tip. Another motif is a single feline, shown seated, and otherwise resembling the lions apart from the lack of a mane. There is also a bird, shown in profile with both wings extended, the feathers of the wing and tail shown by parallel ridges growing out of rounded tufts. The head and neck are slender in contrast to the heavier body; the claw is enormously exaggerated in size.

There is a great uniformity in the style of these animal carvings, which are striking in their resemblance to

the animals of the Bayeux Tapestry. The relief is shallow, but the surface sculpture shows considerable accomplishment, and they are perfectly adapted to the shapes they have to fit.

St. Mary's, Acton, Cheshire (8). The tower dates from the Norman period, but the church was otherwise rebuilt in the late middle ages. There are a group of early looking carved stones, one of which carved with an eagle, looks as if it might have been a capital. The bird is shown standing turned to the front, with both wings extended and its head turned to the side. The beak is long, the upper section turning down at the tip; the eye is small and round, and there is a small crest at the back of the head. The wings are divided, by three parallel lines, into four long feathers, those next to the body on either side being the shortest. The body is decorated by incised horizontal lines, which carry on into the legs, behind which the wedge shaped tail is shown. The legs end in claws with three distinct toes. Behind the head is a looped scroll. The relief is fairly shallow with gently moulded edges.

St. John's, Chester, Cheshire (9) Fig. 1b is a church which dates in part from very soon after the Conquest. In the string course along the north wall is a frieze of dragon like monsters of scandinavian type, in that the ornamental, linear quality of the decoration is more important than the identity

of the animals. Three or four are shown in profile with open mouths, short crouching forelegs and long heavy tails which are knotted or interlaced. The relief is shallow.

St. Petrock's, Egloskerry, Cornwall (10) The tympanum of the blocked north door of the Norman church is carved with a wingless dragon, which is turned to the left but whose head is looking back to snap at the tail. The mouth is open, showing pointed teeth; the jaws are of equal length, the upper being broader than the lower. The small pricked ears grow side by side from the head, and have inner triangular excisions; below them is the almond shaped eye. One leg only is shown, in a forward crouching position and ending in an indeterminate rounded paw, and the elbow joint is pronounced. Beyond this, the body narrows into the tail which bends up, then loops down and behind itself, ending in a three lobed tip which almost touches the nose. Along the upper curve of the tail, the edge is formed by a series of small purely ornamental loops, and the end of it has a double outline. Over the south door of the church is an apparently contemporary Agnus Dei, carved in a similar extremely shallow relief, with slightly rounded edges.

St. Werburga's, Treneglos, Cornwall (11). In the church, which was built in 1858; the only Norman survival is the

tympanum of the interior south door, representing two felines confronted before a central tree; the trunk is straight and decorated with foliage patterns, at the top dividing into two branches which extend over the animals, ending in fan shaped leaves, and between them is a scallop shell. The felines are identical, with rounded, short faces, the mouth indicated by an engraved line, the eye small and almond shaped, one ear only shown with triangular excision. The bodies are thickset, with swelling chests; the legs are short, leaning slightly forward, and ending in rounded paws. The tails bend down between the legs and up over the back to end in leaf shaped tips, like those of the fighting felines on one of the Ely capitals. The carving is done in a gently moulded relief, deeper than that of Egloskerry, with which it has traits in common, the treatment of the ears and paws.

Grasmere, Cumberland (12). In the church there is a carved stone said to come from nearby Glenthorne church; two of the faces are carved with dragons, on the other two are an acanthus pattern and a human figure. The dragons, each under round headed arcades are shown reared up with heads looking back to bite at the tip of the wing, the upper jaw longer and wider than the lower; one has a double outline while the other is engraved with diagonal

lines. The eyes are large and oval with small central dots, and the ears are flattened back along the head. The wing of one dragon is raised, while that of the other is folded along the back. The tails narrow downwards, form a small knot and bend up again, to touch the upper part of the back. Although the carvings stand out from the background quite sharply, the surfaces themselves are fairly flat; it is possible that this stone has once been a carved capital.

St. Cuthbert's, Great Salkeld, Cumberland (13). The church had a fortified tower added to the existing structure in the early twelfth century, and it is to the earlier stage that the carved capitals to the right of the east door most probably belong. On the inmost capital is a snake biting at its own body, which forms an involved pattern of interlace, framing the mask head of a feline with wideset pricked ears. On the next capital, there is a dragon like creature on the left, facing outwards; it lacks wings or legs, but has a head with open, pointed jaws, an oval eye engraved with double outline, and two flattened ears growing from the back of the head, with an inner V-shaped marking. There are two rings around the neck as if indicating a collar, and the body narrows into a tail, which then turns up into a spiral. Facing this dragon is a bird in apparent flight, with both wings raised; it is attacking the animal below it, a small quadruped

also facing the dragon, whose tail bends up over its back, ending in another head, which the bird pecks at with its beak, a theme which recalls the capital at Kensworth. The carvings are moulded, and stand out from the background, and are associated with a chevron arch, suggesting the capitals date from the early twelfth rather than the late eleventh century, despite the parallels between the dragon and that of Grasmere, the Scandinavian looking interlace of the snake's body, and the resemblance of the animal mask with those of the Durham castle capitals.

St. Bees Priory, Cumberland (14). The Benedictine Priory was founded c.1125; the carved stone set up opposite the west door of church might have come from one of the earlier foundations on the site. It represents the combat between St. Michael and the dragon, the saint represented only by a small head and brandished sword rising from behind the dragon's back. The dragon is shown in a crouched position facing to the right, with its head turned back. The upper jaw is curled right over and back in a manner that has Scandinavian affinities; the mouth is wide open, with pointed teeth, the eye, with inner engraved line, comma-shaped, and the ears close together, growing from the back of the head, with the triangular excisions of Leckhampstead and Egloskerry. Below the neck are a series of scalloped lines to represent the scaly body, and these are also used on the upper part of the wing, while two engraved

lines suggest the wing feathers. The body, beyond the wing, narrows, loops down and round behind itself ending in the head of a snake with pointed jaws and protruding tongue. Beyond the dragon is a pattern of interlace of late Hiberno-Saxon type, and within this is a circular medallion containing a bird facing to the right, with turned back head biting at its upraised wing. The relief is quite deep for the carving of the saint and dragon, although the interlace is shallower, and the rectangular shape of the stone, and the way the outline of the dragon is adapted to this suggests that it was intended for the lintel of a doorway as at Dinton. The theme of saint and dragon, the headed tail and the backward-looking bird in the medallion all confirm its place in the Anglo-Norman period.

Holy Trinity Chapel, Ashford, Derby (15).

In the south wall of the originally early Norman church has been reset a tympanum showing a boar and another animal, probably a hound, confronted before a central tree. The boar, on the left, is recognised by the distinctive ridge along the upper back, with engraved lines to represent the bristles, and by its short grooved tail. The legs end in hooves, and the body is thickset. The head is small and neat, with the upper lip extended, like a tusk, to touch the tree, and the ear sticks up. The confronting hound is shown with its front legs bent up at the joint to touch the other side of

the tree. It has two pricked ears, open mouth with the tongue shown and a line around the neck to indicate the collar. The body is slender, and the tail bends up to end in a leafy tip. The relief is fairly shallow, with gently moulded edges. The theme of two confronted animals of different type, as at Lathbury, is a fairly frequent one.

St. John the Baptist, Ault Hucknall, Derby (16). The church has both Saxon and early Norman details, and the carved stones, tympanum and lintel, now let into the west wall, can most probably be dated from soon after the Conquest. On the upper part are three figures: on the left stands a centaur, with animal body turned to the right, but human upper part facing the front. The hair is long, reaching beyond the chin on either side of the face, where the eyes, nose and mouth are indicated. The arms, clad in long full sleeves are extended, the left hand holding up a leafy branch, and the right a long sword, pointing downwards. Around the waist is a knotted girdle, and the garment seems to be that of a cleric. The animal body is shown with a swelling chest, and rather sagging middle; on the front legs, the horse like hooves are shown the wrong way round, and one of the hind legs ends in a claw. Facing this centaur is another large quadruped. Its head is like that of a bird, having a long neck and beak, and no ears; and all four legs end in three-toed claws. The tail bends down between the two hind legs and up behind the back ending

in a wheel-headed cross of the type more normally balanced on the front leg of an Agnus Dei. Behind this animal follows a very small beast, with pricked ears, short legs and a long straight tail. Below this group are St. Michael and dragon. The saint is a small clumsy figure in profile, holding sword and shield and wearing a long skirted tunic. The opposing dragon has a large head with a protruding barbed tongue and diamond-shaped eye. The rudimentary wing and looped tail, with an engraved line down the centre seem to grow straight out of the neck; the legs are extremely short, the front claw with two toes and the back one with three.

The general style of the carvings gives a heavy, clumsy effect, although the relief stands out and the surfaces are slightly moulded. The choice of subjects and positioning shows a post-Conquest date, although the sculptor has not understood his models very well. The large animal is a grotesque parody of the Agnus Dei, with griffin like treatment of the feet and head; and the saint and dragon appear frequently in Anglo-Norman carvings, at Dinton and St. Bees being also used for the lintel.

St. Helen's, Darley Dale, Derby (17) Fig. 2 ^e L In the Domesday Book, a church is mentioned here; one piece of sculpture found in the churchyard in 1875 and another set in the west end of the tower could both belong to this pre-1085 phase. The first piece shows an animal facing to the

the right. It has a long thick tail hanging straight down, four stiff legs ending in three toed feet, a neck which continues the rigid line of the back, and head pointing down. The ear is large and pricked, the eye suggested by a bulge in the forehead between the ear base and muzzle. The body is not really moulded but treated in a slightly rounded relief.

The second slab shows two animals, a dragon seated behind a feline, which turns its head back to snarl at it. The dragon's head has an upper jaw jutting over the lower one, with a faintly Scandinavian air, an angular ridge of brow, and pointed, flattened ear. The neck is long, and the body quite thin; the tail curves down and under the body, so that it appears to be sitting on it, the body and raised wing forming an S-shape. The legs are thin, and touch the ground beside the bend of the tail. The other animal has a wide open mouth on the backward looking head, with similar ridged brow and pointed ear, and the eye is almond shaped. The body and legs are fairly thin, and the tail bends down between the hind legs and up behind the back.

The style of the two does not suggest that they were necessarily part of the same slab; the latter pair show a more accomplished treatment, reminiscent of some of the animals on the Tapestry, in contrast to the heavy, clumsy look of the first animal which finds parallels in similarly primitive carvings of the early Anglo-Norman phase.

St. Bartholomew's, Hognaston, Derby (18). The tympanum of the Norman south door represents a group of eight figures. The central one is a man wearing a belted gown, in his right hand holding a long staff with curved top and pointed tip, which might be a crozier, in the left clutching a book to his chest. To his right is the Agnus Dei, facing him; above it are two birds seen in clumsy profile with one above the other, facing away from the cleric. On his other side, four animals are turned towards him, one pair above another. The first upper animal is a boar, with large ears, snout, small round eye, cleft hooves and curly tail. Below it is another quadruped with a similar head, but longer legs, seeming to end in claws, a short tail, and lacking the distinctive rounded body of the boar. They are followed by two smaller animals with pointed noses, narrow bodies and thin tails. The carving is done in a relief so shallow that it is barely more than engraving on the surface: it is more like a drawing than a sculpture, but the figures have been distorted to fit them into the semicircular outline of the tympanum, in particular the two last quadrupeds. The theme of animals associated with the Agnus Dei or a clerical figure is not unusual in the Anglo-Norman group; the origin of the motif, it will be suggested, might lie in Ireland.

All Saint's, Kedleston, Derby (19). The tympanum of the south

door of the early Norman church was originally carved with what may have been a hunting scene; now there only survives a figure to the right, which represents a man on horseback. His head is shown in profile, although the shoulders and arms are treated as if seen from the front; one arm is raised, and holds a curved horn to his lips, the other grips the rein of the horse. One foot is shown in a stirrup below the horse's body. This animal is not very successfully done: it is on a smaller scale than its rider, with a short head, longish neck, heavy looking legs and a thin, pointed tail. Obliterated figures fill the rest of the space; they might have represented hounds and a deer or boar victim, if one can compare the carvings at Durham, Little Langford and Tutbury, and also some of the scenes on the Tapestry.

Parwich, Derby (20). The tympanum now over the west and formerly over the south doorway, which dates from the early twelfth century, represents a group of animals with the Agnus Dei; this is shown on the extreme left side balancing a wheel-headed cross on its bent front leg, and facing inwards. Immediately above its head is a bird with long beak, large claws and rounded tail. They are confronted by a stag, with antler represented by a large leaf-shaped projection from the head, with central engraved ridge, and short lines around the edge. It has a short tail

and cleft hooves; beneath the front legs are the entwined heads, with long tongues, of two snakes whose bodies extend beneath the stag and Agnus Dei respectively. Above the deer, facing the other way, is a boar recognisable by its plump curved back, with row of bristles, large ears and knotted tail. Below it, and behind the stag, is a feline, with head turned back to bite at the tip of its tail, which is treated as a great trilobate leaf. It has pointed teeth, protruding tongue and almond shaped eye; and the feet end in sharp curved claws. The carving is carried out in an extremely shallow relief, and the whole tympanum has close affinities with Hognaston, in this almost engraved technique, and in the nature of the scene: the confrontation of the Agnus Dei, a bird over its head (the Holy Dove?) with a group of animals, including a boar and a nondescript feline. The trampling of the snakes is an additional symbolic motif, here perhaps compensating for the absence of the cleric. It is not improbable that the two carvings were done by the same hand.

St. Michael, Shirley, Derby (21). A carved stone, discovered during alterations in 1842 is now let into the east wall outside the north aisle; its rectangular shape suggests that it was the lintel of the original Norman church. The stone is incomplete at either end. The central figures are two quadrupeds, advancing towards the right; the rear animal

lacks back legs and tail, but might represent a hind. It has a long neck, which follows the straight line of the back, so that the head appears to hang down. The long muzzled head, with pricked ears, seems to be biting the rear of the animal in front, of which the bent hind legs and long straight body only survive. A bird is perched on its back with a hunched body and long beak which seems about to peck the nose of the animal behind; there is no indication of wing, and it has a short stumpy leg. On either side of the forelegs of the biting animal are two small quadrupeds, probably meant to represent hounds; they are shown reared up as if attacking the hind. Below the body of the front hind is a smaller small animal, but this part of the slab is broken off. The upper border of the slab has a pattern of cable-like moulding. The carving stands out from the background in fairly sharp relief, but the raised surfaces are flat. The treatment of the hind, with rigid neck and hanging down, large eared head resembles the single animal at Darley Dale; and the theme of attacking hounds and bird finds parallels in the carvings of Man and Ireland, which will be examined in the next section.

Stanton-by-Bridge, Derby (22). Fig. 2b. Let into the wall of the farmhouse at St. Bride's is a sculptured slab which can perhaps be associated with the nearby early Norman church. It shows an animal with body seen in profile and head turned

to the front. The face is mask-like with wideset, neat pricked ears, and it joins the body abruptly; the body is long, with four short legs and a tail which bends up and over the back, the tip almost touching the head. The general effect is clumsy, and the animal virtually unrecognisable, although the position of head and tail suggest that it is a feline.

St. James, Swarkestone, Derby (23). Fig. 2d. The tympanum of the south door was destroyed during over-zealous restorations in 1876. It represented two identical animals confronted before a central tree; they have large heavy heads, with open jaws faintly ridged on the inside to represent teeth. The upper front legs, ending in three-toed claws, are raised to touch the trunk of the tree, and resting on the body of a serpent, which passes behind the tree. The bodies are wide at the neck but narrow towards the tails, which bend down between the legs and up behind the back; the hind legs are shown in a vigorously striding position. The snake is curved in the shape of an S; the open-mouthed head is to the right of the trunk, and on the left it is trodden under the other front leg of the animal. The tree has a smooth trunk, dividing into two short leafy branches at the top; the upper edge of the tympanum is shown as a series of cusped arches, and the animals are standing on an arcade which forms the lintel. The theme of animals confronted before a tree is common in the Anglo-Norman group; the associated snake perhaps

refers to Satan in his disguise as the serpent in Eden, and its position recalls that of Parwich.

St. Lawrence's, Whitwell, Derby (24). Fig. 2c. The lintel of the south chancel doorway is decorated with three rosettes in a row. Between the first and second, from right to left is a slender feline, turned to the left, with one front leg raised, its head looking backwards, and the tail bent between the hind legs and up over the back; its legs are long and thin, and the paws have two toes. Below the first rosette is another small quadruped, upside down, with head towards the centre of the lintel. It looks like a small deer. Beneath both these animals is a scroll pattern with leafy tendrils.

St. James, Bondleigh, Devon (25). The tympanum of the Norman south door has a central medallion of cable moulding, containing the Agnus Dei. On either side, outside the border, is a bird, with body facing outwards, and head turned back to look at the lamb. The wings are indicated, furled along the back, the feathers shown by lightly engraved parallel lines; the legs have large three-toed claws. The birds are rather thickset, with short necks, legs and tail, and closely resemble many on the Bayeux Tapestry, suggesting that the carving belongs quite early in the phase. The relief is shallow, and there

is little trace of moulding.

St. Mary, Ideford, Devon (26). Plate 1. In the otherwise modern church has been reset a gabled lintel, which must have come from an original Norman doorway. It represents a dragon and a bird confronted before two scallop shapes in a semicircular medallion. The dragon is on the left; it has a bird-like head, with a crest at the back, open mouth, with double outlining, and an engraved almond shaped eye with a central dot. The wing lies along the curve of the body, the upper short feathers being indicated by dots, the long ones by parallel engraved lines. The tail bends up over the body, and back behind the neck, bending down to touch the ground in front; there is one short leg. The bird facing it is seen in profile, with a long hooked beak. It has a similar wing lying along the back, and another sticking up which, like the wedge shaped tail, has three deep grooves to mark the feathers, and it has two short legs with no indication of claws. The carving stands quite sharply from its background, but the surfaces are generally flat. The figures fit well into the lintel shape, being slightly distorted sideways; and if the carving had been a tympanum, the central scalloped leaves would probably have been made into the Tree. This scallop pattern is also seen at Treneglos, at the top of the central tree. The dragon with the tail bending up over the body appears on the Tapestry, and is here rather an unusual type.

Wynford Eagle, Dorset (27). Reset in the west wall of the church built in 1842 is a semicircular carved stone which must have been the tympanum of the early twelfth century church. It represents two confronted dragons, set in panels; they are shown reared up with the tails curled under as if to support the body, with the two front legs stretching forward to touch the other's paw. The heads have open pointed jaws, sharp protruding tongues, and flattened ears. The greatest width of the body is where the legs join it, the further front paws resting on the ground, with a number of toes indicated; then it tapers into the narrow tail which bends right round and up towards the legs. The dragon on the right has one raised wing, triangular in shape and engraved with parallel lines for the wing feathers. The relief is not deep, the surface being uniformly flat, and a rounded edge separates it from the background. The figures are well designed to fit their circular frame; similar dragon types occur on the Tapestry.

The Chapel of Durham Castle (28). The six capitals in the chapel, which dates from 1072, are decorated with a combination of animal, human, geometric and foliage ornament. The historically attested date is confirmed by the type of capital, choice of subject, and style of the decoration, all of which contrast sharply with anything that had gone before,

and can most logically be ascribed to the influence of the newcomers. The capitals are of the Norman, Corinthian-derived type, and animal motifs form a significant element of their carved decoration. The third capital of the north arcade has three faces decorated with a unified scene; on the west is a stag, its body in profile turned to the right, but with head facing the front, so that both large round eyes, wideset small ears and four-branched antlers can be seen. The body is engraved with diagonally crossing lines; the legs grow from the body side by side, with no indication of near or off leg. The neck is merely a projection from the line of the back, and the head hangs down from it. On either side of the head are two small figures which leap up, at right angles; they are shown with only one leg to indicate each pair, and these are bent sharply at the elbow joint. These represent hounds; on the adjacent south face are another pair, also advancing towards the stag, one above the other, with again only two legs each. A nimbed human figure, facing the front holds the lead of the upper hound, and in his other hand, which bends around the corner under the angle volute to the east face, is the rein of his horse, whose body is in profile, and whose head, like the stag, faces the front. It has the same round staring eyes, a roughly incised mane, the same stiff legs and engraved body and two ridges on the back to represent the saddle. On the fourth face is an ornamental mask.

On the central capital of the south arcade, on the north and east faces are confronted felines, with the bodies in profile and heads turned to the front, almost touching, so that the resulting slight projection forms the angle volute. They are set on a diapered background, and the bodies are again patterned with diagonally engraved lines. Like the hounds, they have only two legs each, bent forward at the elbow joint and ending in five distinct claws; the forepaws almost touch each other. The faces have large round eyes and wideset ears, with central triangular excisions, and the tails are long and thin, hanging straight down.

On the first capital of the north arcade is a snake, with a similarly patterned body, and set on the diapered background; the head is seen from the top, with both eyes indicated, and the body bends round and under itself in a circular loop. On another face is a mermaid, her patterned tail seen in profile, and curving round almost onto the next face, while the upper part of the body is seen from the front, arms raised in the orante position, and the hands, with clearly marked figures are particularly large. The hair is parted in the middle, and falls to the shoulders on either side of the face, in which eyes, nose and somewhat toothy mouth are indicated. Another carving is a seated feline, with patterned body, and head turned back over the shoulder to bite at the tip of the tail, which has curved up over the

back between the hind legs. The paws, with sharp claws, wave in the air, and the wideset, triangular ears are like those of the other feline pair.

Several of the capital faces have masks filling the triangular space between the volutes; one is definitely animal, of the same breed as the felines, with their round eyes, and pricked ears; the tongue hangs out, to touch one of the upright leaves springing from the neckings which are a feature of the capital decoration.

The most striking feature of the Durham style is its uniformity and its early date. It is already well adapted to its architectural function - each of the carvings is admirably designed for its setting. The three hunting scene faces can each stand alone, and yet are linked with rare sophistication which is about twenty years ahead of its time - that of the historiated capital. The confronted felines on adjacent faces, with linked heads and paws are also beautifully planned. The relief is uniformly shallow, but the outlines are slightly rounded. There is little attempt at actual modelling but variety is obtained between the actual outline of the animal and the specific features within it. The diapered background on several of the faces gives a rich effect, and makes the unelaborate carving above it stand out more clearly. To have an established date for this series is vital from the point of view of comparison;

a number of features characteristic of the whole Anglo-Norman style are already present while the use of animal ornament is seen in a religious and architectural context. Whether the sculptors were Normans working for the first time in England, or Englishmen working under Norman orders is not important; the carvings show the Anglo-Norman style which has already developed as a result of the Conquest, and are evidence of a high degree of accomplishment.

St. Nicholas, Ampney St. Mary, Gloucester (29). A church and priest are mentioned in the Domesday Survey, and the carving, in the shape of a steeply gabled lintel over the blocked north door seems to be of this period. A griffin and a lion are confronted over two feline heads, which form the termination of the two ends of roll moulding marking the top of the doorway. The griffin on the left has the head and beak of a bird, and the body of a winged feline. The tail bends down between the hind legs and up over the back, ending in an ivy-leaf shaped tail. The legs are short and thin, the front far paw raised almost to touch that of the lion, which occupies about two-thirds of the carving, and extends over the two heads below it. It is shown with the head turned to the front, the cat-like features indicated, and the mane shown by a series of ridges along the neck. The tail also comes between the

legs and up over the back, ending in a large lobed tip; one hind leg is bent forward at the joint, and the other extends back to the edge of the border. Below the body are the two large feline heads with bulging eyes like those at Durham, surrounded by the coil of the neck which bends round into the upper sill of the doorway. The relief is not deep, but shows some attempt at modelling; it is a well planned piece of carving, the lion and griffin being fitted skilfully around the heads and into the trapezoid shape of the stone. While the theme of confronted lion and griffin is normal to the period, the coiled heads are unusual, and find their closest parallels in the Scandinavian carvings of Northumbria.

St. Barbara's, Beckford, Gloucester (30). There was a church in existence by the time of Domesday, with which the tympana of the north and south doors can probably be associated. The south door carving represents a central plain cross, on the right arm of which is perched a hunched looking, very simply shown bird, while over the left arm is a round object. On either side of the cross, placed at a slight diagonal angle rather than standing square on the ground are a pair of confronted horned animals. The one on the left has a head which seems turned to the front, for both eyes, represented by small double circles are shown, and thin, engraved lines mark the position of the mouth. From its head project two tall straight horns, two small

triangular ears, and a fifth projection in the middle, neither quite ear nor horn. The head abruptly joins the body, with no indication of neck, and hangs down from the stiff line of the back. The four legs are all shown on the same plane, with no indication of near or off side; they end in clumsy two-toed feet. The tail is extremely short and ends in a point. The other animal is of the same breed, except that its head is shown in profile, as there is only one eye, and there are lines like whiskers engraved on the muzzle; it has no fifth ear/horn, and the tail is long and hanging straight down. The relief is fairly shallow, and the surfaces are flat. It is conceivably possible that the animals are meant to symbolise the Agnus Dei, which is sometimes shown with horns; and the associated cross is not being held in its hoof, but is standing between the symmetrically duplicated animals. The bird, the round eye-like object on the other side and the cross itself could stand for the Trinity. The early date of the carving is suggested by the parallels there are with Durham in the stiff back, hanging heads and dangling legs of the confronted animals; in particular the awkward manner in which the head of the animal on the left is turned to face the front, which recalls the deer at Durham.

On the north door is a scene which represents the Harrowing of Hell; Christ with one hand opens the mouth of the grave, and with the other, thrusts a sword down into the



mouth of a dragon, represented by its head only; the jaws, which have double outlining are opened wide, and have small pointed teeth. The eye, also outlined, is almond shaped, and the two ears, growing side by side, have inner triangular excisions as at Leckhampstead and St. Bees, a trait which seems to be characteristic of an early phase in the Anglo-Norman group. The use of the symbolic dragon's mouth to represent hell, and the sword being thrust straight down into it suggests that the source lies in a manuscript of the Anglo-Saxon period, which the delicately carved foliage pattern on the lintel would tend to confirm, its treatment being completely two-dimensional.

Dumbleton, Gloucester (31). The Norman tympanum has been reset over the north door of the fifteenth century church. The carving represents an animal mask, with a wedge shaped face, wideset, large, triangular ears, with the centres hollowed out, round staring eyes, rounded nose, and a mouth which holds three branches. These each end in three lozenge shaped leaves, which bear a striking resemblance to the foliage growing out of the dragons at Leckhampstead, and also the sprig carved on one of the faces at Durham. From each ear grows a strip of scalloped moulding, which bends round under the head encircling the leafy sprigs. The use of the eared mask head is also seen at Durham, and the

shallow relief, with some attempt at rounded edges suggests that the carving is quite early in the group.

St. Michael's, Harnhill, Gloucester (32). The carved lintel of the south door dates from the Norman period in the otherwise later church. The combat of Saint Michael and the dragon is represented; the saint stands on the left with body facing front, the left hand holding up a sword, the right a round shield. The dragon faces him in a vigorous attitude of combat. The mouth is open, showing tongue and teeth; the two ears are pricked, with the characteristic triangular excisions. The head and swelling chest are vertical, and the two legs are bent forward, one shown raised as if pawing at the shield. There is one wing, which is extended above the back and engraved with parallel lines. The tail is looped twice, and bends round underneath the body. Although the relief is not very deep, the surfaces are well moulded, and the two figures are well designed to fit the rectangular form of the lintel.

St. Mary's, Lower Swell, Gloucester (33). While the nave and elaborately carved chancel arch date from the middle of the twelfth century, the tympanum of the south door seems to date from the first building phase, at the very beginning of the century. It consists of

ten stones, forming the semi-circular shape; rather low on the right side is a bird leaning forward to peck at a central tree. The outlines are simple, the head and tail consisting of little more than rounded extensions of the body; there is no indication of the wing, but both legs are shown, straight and thin. The asymmetry of the composition suggests that another bird was intended on the other side of the tree. The relief is shallow, and the surfaces extremely flat.

St. Stephen's, Moreton Valence, Gloucester (34). The tympanum of the north door of the early twelfth century church represents St. Michael and the dragon. The saint is shown turned to the front, with head in three-quarter view; he wears a long tunic and halo, has one wing extended at the back, and holds a shield and a spear which he points at a slight diagonal, into the dragon's mouth. The dragon is shown with body turned away, but head looking back open mouthed, with a large, wide tongue which points upwards and ends in three points. The eye is oval, the ear quite long and hanging down on the top of the head. Both wings are shown, having the same delicate treatment as that of the saint, with two rows of slender feathers, and a spirally curling tip. The lower part of the body runs parallel to the lintel, with the front leg, from which the wing grows, extended forward; the tail is loosely knotted, and ends in a trilobate, leafy

tip. The spaces between the saint and dragon and the semi-circular frame are filled with foliage motifs. The relief is not deep, but is gently modelled so that the figures stand out from the background, and inner details, like the wing feathers and the knot of the tail are suggested by moulding rather than engraving. The effect however is still a very smooth one, which suggests the influence of a manuscript model. The scene shows rather more sophistication and accomplishment than is characteristic of the Anglo-Norman style; the dragon is more graceful than ferocious, while the position of the saint's head and feet, conveying a difficult angle, is evidence of the draughtsman rather than the sculptor. While the dragon's long tongue can be compared to those of dragons in the Tapestry, the body treatment does not correspond so well; for this reason, it is probable that the hypothetical manuscript source was of pre-Conquest tradition.

St. Catherine's, North Cerney, Gloucester (35). On the external walls of the early Norman church are engraved two animals, which by their choice and style can be attributed to the Anglo-Norman group. To the left side of the south door is a centaur, the human upper part seen from the front, and the animal body in profile. The head has short hair, and clearly marked human features. The shoulders are square, and the arms bend upward at the elbow joint to end

in large hands, with each finger showing, in the orant position of the Durham mermaid. The lower body is horse-like: the two front legs have been omitted, but the hind legs have convincing pasterns and hooves, and the long tail stretches out behind. The other animal, a feline, is at the south west corner of the tower; its head, with wideset pricked ears, large eyes and grinning mouth faces the front, while the body is in profile. The far front paw is raised, and all the feet have three-toed pointed claws. The surface is rather weathered, but the tail appears to bend down between the hind legs, and up over the back. The choice of centaur and feline is not uncommon in the Anglo-Norman group, and they are associated at Salford and Stoke-sub-Hamden. The use of engraving to cover several stones on the outer facade, in no way related to architectural decoration is not characteristic of the period; it seems a reflection of the use of painted decoration on the inside of churches, designed to cover a flat area of wall. At the same time, there might be some influence from the Scandinavian graffiti which, in the twelfth century stave churches were common on walls and columns, as well as the more elaborate relief carving (36).

St. Peter's, Stratton, Gloucester (37). A priest is mentioned in the Domesday Survey; and the reset tympanum of the south door and other traces in the south wall of the

twelfth century church probably date from this earlier period. The carving of the tympanum represents two animals and two snakes confronted before a central tree. The treatment of the animals, shown with heads facing the front and tails bent down between the hind legs and up over the back suggests that they are felines. On the head of the animal on the left are four pointed projections, looking like a crown, while that on the right seems to wear a small cap; the features of each face are indicated, resembling those of the feline at North Cerney. The legs end in pointed, two-toed claws. Between each animal and the trunk of the tree are snakes with looped bodies, and open jaws which seem to bite at the animals' heads. Leafy tendrils from the tree grow all around them. The relief is extremely shallow, and there is little attempt at surface modelling; the diapered pattern on the lintel resembles the background of some of the Durham capitals. The snake associated with the central tree also occurs at Swarkestone and the theme of confronted animals enmeshed in foliage is seen at Wordwell, Knook and Lathbury.

St. Larence's, Alton, Hants. (38) The original church dates from the late eleventh century; the central tower survives, the capitals of whose arches are carved in a series reminiscent of the Durham group. The inner face of the south west pier is carved with a dragon-like figure,

rearing up and turning to the left, but with head turned back and tucked down into the neck. On the south face of the north west pier is a feline in profile, facing the left, with a single pricked ear, oval eye and open mouth, with long tongue ending in a leafy tip. The legs are shown bent at the elbow joint in a slightly crouched position; the tail extends outward, curling back at the similarly leafy tip. On the north east face is a bird standing facing the right, with long straight legs ending in pointed claws; one wing is up and the tail is wedge shaped. On the west face of the north east pier is a similar bird, shown however upside down with the head looking back towards the raised wing; another crouched bird is shown on the south east face, and beside it in a double scalloped capital two confronted, backward-looking felines biting at the tips of their arched tails, with the legs tucked beneath them. Of the whole series, these are the pair that fit best into the shape of their capital; the others seem more haphazardly placed, while, as at Durham, other faces are left plain, or have foliage patterns. The animals are themselves neatly carved, with the bodies in proportion; the relief is extremely shallow and the surfaces flat, giving a two dimensional effect, as if the original model had been painted decoration.

St. Mildred's, Whippingham, Hants. I.O.W. (39). The church

was known from Domesday; although the earliest surviving parts date from the thirteenth century, the carved slab built into the wall of the south porch dates from the earliest phase. It represents a pair of mounted knights confronted before a central tree; the one on the left wears a conical helmet, that on the right carries a shield of the type shown on the Tapestry, and the figures are otherwise lacking in features, apart from the stiff feet projecting below the horse, whose angle suggests that they are in stirrups. The horses are shown rather small for their riders, with short necks and heads held down by the reins; the legs are short and stiff, and the tails hang straight down. The general style is one of clumsy angularity, and gives the impression of having had the background gouged out rather than any sense of relief or moulding. The roughly rectangular shape of the slab suggests that it might have been a lintel rather than a tympanum.

St. Margaret's, Covington, Hunts. (40). The present church has a twelfth century nave, the north doorway incorporating a reset semicircular sunk panel which appears to date from an earlier phase. It is carved with two confronted felines; they both have squarish muzzles, short, broad necks, tails which bend down between the hind legs and up over the back, and legs ending in distinct claws, the front legs two-toed, the back with more. The one on the left has its head

raised higher than the other, with open jaws, and it holds up its further front leg; the end of the tail divides in two, forming two scalloped lines along the back. Behind the ear is a tendril of foliage. The carving is not particularly skilful, having rather a clumsy look, but the figures stand out quite well from their background and fit successfully into the shape of tympanum.

St. James, Little Paxton, Hunts. (41) The church has evidence of several phases of twelfth century building. The carved tympanum of the south door has in the centre a wheel-headed cross and on either side of it an animal in a grazing position. The one on the left seems to be a boar, with snout like muzzle, heavy body and very short tail, with only one leg to represent each pair. That on the right has all four legs, with no indication of perspective, a humped back, and what looks like a human head seen in profile. Above it is a horse-like animal, with open, long jaws, oval eye and two pricked ears. The four slender legs are all bent sharply at the joint and the tail is long and hangs straight down. On the far left, standing behind the 'boar' is a human figure, facing the front; the right hands holds a cross and the left a small stick like object. The facial features are indicated, and the "cleric" wears trousers. The relief is extremely shallow, being little more than surface engraving; the general style is clumsy, and the

figures are not very well composed to fit the shape that they fill.

The scene appears to be of the same type as Hognaston and Parwich; different animal types are associated with the symbolic cross, apparently worshipping it, and brought together by a clerical figure. The curved stick in his hand might be a knife; he is possibly contemplating a sacrifice, which might be an interesting pagan survival. The long legged animal resembles the crouched pair at Alton, while the lack of perspective on those of the human headed quadruped also suggests an early date in the group.

St. Botolph's, Stow Longa, Hunts. (42) There is evidence of thirteenth century rebuilding of the original structure, when the carved tympanum over the south chancel doorway was reset. This would seem to date from an early twelfth century phase, of which there are certain remains. The central figure is a mermaid, the fish tail is profile, with three pairs of grooved fins and wedge-shaped tip pointing to the right, and upper part of the body facing the front. The arms are in the orant position of the mermaid of Durham and centaur of North Cerney; the fingers and thumbs are indicated. The hair is long, reaching almost to the shoulders on either side of the thin neck. On the left of the mermaid, facing inward, is an animal seen in profile, with

a long tail, bent at the tip, and four legs, ending in two-toed claws, of which the front far leg is raised over a square object on the ground marked with a saltire cross. It has a rounded head with two pointed ears and protruding tongue. On the right of the mermaid is another quadruped, with round mask-like face turned to the front, and tail curving down between the hind legs and up over the back; the legs all end in two toed claws. These traits would suggest that a feline was intended, but the sculptor seems to have been trying to represent the Agnus Dei: the tail ends in the rounded segment of a wheel headed cross, with inner spoke-like projections, while the further front leg is bent up at the knee to touch the belly. On more typical representations of the Lamb, the cross would have been balanced on this front leg; the sculptor of Stow Longa has achieved the leg position, and a part of the cross, but by attaching it to the tail has made the animal meaningless. The relief stands out at an even level from the background, and there is no attempt at moulding. The capitals of the doorway, with interlaced snake shapes with beaded moulding seem to be of a later phase.

St. Clement's, Sandwich, Kent (43). Of the church mentioned in the Domesday book, there only survives the Norman tower, and the carved tympanum of the belfry door at its north west angle. The decoration is elaborate and mainly geometrical,

consisting of a bottom row of overlapping arcades, with central beading, and above it, similarly beaded circles intersected by a straight line and a series of diagonals. The tympanum consists of three stones, a lower lintel shaped one, which has the majority of the ornament, and two much smaller segments above it; of these, the one on the right is carved with a stag and a bird, is virtually lacking in the other ornament, and is in much shallower relief, as if the animal motifs had not been a part of the original geometric design. The stag faces the left with its hooved legs in a walking position. The muzzle is narrow, and the antlers indicated by a single projection from the back of the head, with a central engraved line and short diagonal lines branching from it, similar to the treatment of the antler at Parwich. Behind the stag is a small bird, with one raised wing, wedge shaped and engraved with lines, like the tail, short neck and body, and rudimentary legs. Both deer and bird are rather clumsy carvings; they can hardly be recognised amongst the elaboration of the other ornament, apart from them being tucked away in the upper corner, and it is possible that they were not originally intended for this position. The association of flying bird and deer is not characteristic of the Anglo-Norman group, but finds parallels and a possible source of origin in the pre-Conquest carvings of Scotland.

St. Michael's, Hallaton, Leicester (44). Now built into the

wall of the north porch of the originally twelfth century church is a carving of the saint and dragon. The saint, with extended wings and flowing draperies is shown in profile kneeling on the body of his victim; in the right hand is a long spear, which passes diagonally across his body to pierce the dragon's lower jaw; in the other hand is a round shield of the Anglo-Saxon type, as at Moreton Valence. The dragon lies on the ground, apparently on its back, with its head barely raised, to receive the fatal thrust. The mouth is open, with a broad lower jaw, and the ears are wideset and flattened. The body widens sharply after the neck, and the saint seems to kneel on the wing, although it is barely distinguishable from the body. The tail is long and sinuous, and the foot of the saint is braced against it. The carving is done in a gently moulded relief, and is admirably composed to fit the semicircular shape of the tympanum, with the saint making the height, his shield and wing filling the two sides, and the dragon extending into the bottom corner. There is a slight confusion of iconography in the scene, as when the saint is shown on top of the dragon he is usually standing, and his victory is symbolised by the sword that is being thrust straight down into the dragon's mouth; while the diagonal spear motif is used when the two are still in combat. The treatment here can be regarded as a fully Anglo-Norman adaptation of the earlier Anglo-Saxon manuscript motifs.

St. Michael's, Stoney Stanton, Leics. (45) The tympanum over the north chancel was formerly set over the south doorway. It represents a human figure and a group of four animals. The man stands on the left, facing the front, and is evidently a cleric, for in one hand he holds up a crozier and in the other a bell; lines engraved on his chest represent the folds of a robe. Standing in front of him is a feline, its head, with large staring eyes, nose and moustache-like mouth, facing the front. The body seems to be leaning back, so that the legs are at a slight angle; they end in three toed claws. The tail bends down between the hind legs and up on to the back, although not extending above it, and ends in a lozenge shaped tip. Immediately below the mouth, so that it seems to be biting at it is the lower front paw of another feline, whose other front paw, which is raised up, ends in the head of a bird. This animal is crouched on the ground, the backward looking head biting the tip of the tail, which comes down between the hind legs and up over the back. It is being attacked by a dragon which leaps on it from behind, biting at the feline's muzzle and clawing at its back. The mouth is open, with pointed jaws and tongue, and the pricked ear has an inner triangular excision. There is a small raised wing, and only the one short leg is shown ending in four long claws. The tail bends down to the ground, ending in curled tendrils and lozenge shaped leaves. The dragon in its turn is being attacked by a bird whose claw, with one large toe to the

back and two to the front, grasps the feline's ear, and whose beak pecks at the dragon's neck. The wing grows out of the outlines of the leg and is raised over the back, with no indication of feathering. The tail is wedge shaped, but a hole has been gouged out of the tympanum at this point which divides the bird's tail from the cleric.

The relief is extremely deep, and well modelled; otherwise, the tympanum would seem to date from an early period in the Anglo-Norman group. The head of the first feline closely compares to those at Durham and Cambridge, and the way the tail lies on the back is also like those at Cambridge and the equally early Netheravon. The treatment of the dragon's tail is like those of Leckhampstead, again resembling the foliage at Durham and Dumbleton. The scene is skilfully handled, in the confusing of attacking animals, and there is some degree of perspective in the placing of the legs, and the way in which the feline stands in front of the cleric. Otherwise, the symbolism of the group, cleric and animals, compares to those at Hognaston, Parwich and Covington, and can be perhaps ultimately derived from Irish cross sculpture.

St. Mary's, Barnetby-le-Wold, Lincs. (46) The church can be dated to the period of Saxo-Norman overlap; over the round-headed window in the south wall of the nave is a slab carved with a feline, the body in profile, turned to the right, and the head facing the front. The head is

triangular in shape, with extremely wideset ears, and facial features indicated, the eyes shown by dots. The legs are no more than thin lines, with no joints or feet shown, and they grow side by side from the body with no sense of perspective. The tail bends down past the hind legs, although not properly between them, and curls over on the back. The carving is done in a low flat relief. Apart from the architectural date, stylistically also the carving seems very early in the phase; the artist is copying the features of a feline, without fully understanding them - the tail does not go between the hind legs, the legs themselves are ridiculously short, and the head is very clumsily attached to the body. The placing of the carving over the window, which seems contemporary, rather than the door is unusual; possibly this was a more frequent position than surviving evidence suggests.

St. Medard's, Little Bytham, Lincs. (47) The church has some evidence of a Saxon phase of occupation, but the tympanum of the door at the south side of the chancel can most probably be attributed to the early Norman period. It consists of twenty-four flat square panels around the upper part; in the central section is a deeply recessed medallion, now empty, and on either side two shallower medallions carved with confronted birds. The wings are

extended, one above and one below the body and, like the long wedge shaped tails, are engraved with parallel lines for the feathers. The legs are quite long, ending in distinct claws; the birds generally resemble those at Kensworth rather than the Tapestry type, which are seen at Bondleigh. Below the medallions, now in rather bad condition, are further carvings, one of which seems to be a quadruped with its head turned back. The relief is very shallow, and the surfaces fairly flat. The theme of two birds confronting a central medallion is also seen at Bondleigh, and the comparison of the birds to those at Kensworth and Bramber would place it quite early in the group.

St. Mary's, Kenninghall, Norfolk (48). Now set on the jambs of the Norman south door is a slab carved with a horse, which has perhaps been a part of an earlier tympanum, as the horse is advancing towards a ridge, which might have been the trunk of a central tree between a pair of horses. It is shown striding forward, the further front leg raised in a high-stepping position. The head is held down by a rein which runs across the neck, and is attached to the saddle, which is shown by two ridges on the back. The neck is short and arched, and the muzzle broad, with two pricked ears shown as if from a frontal view, although the head is in profile. The tail is long and hangs straight down, with a grooved pattern

on it. The relief is not deep, but the surfaces are slightly rounded; the general impression is of an uncluttered accomplishment.

St. Botolph's, Barton Segrave, Northants. (48) The chancel, nave and tower are of the early Norman period, with which the carved tympanum of the north door can be associated. It is made up of eight separate slabs, three in the lower and five in the upper row, which have evidently not been carved in situ and, like Sandwich, alternate geometrical and animal ornament with a strangely unbalanced effect. The stones of the lower row are carved with a pair of lions confronted before a central mask-head. The lions are shown in profile; they have large heads, with open jaws, double-outlined; in the mouth of the lion on the left is another human head which is in process of being swallowed. The eyes and brows are shown by engraved lines, and the ears have inner triangular markings. The manes are clearly marked by overlapping rows of tear shaped curls, resembling the style of some on the Tapestry. The front legs, only one each, are shown bent forward at the elbow joint, in a crouched position, ending in two-toed claws; the curves of the tympanum frame cuts off the back end, as if the stones had originally been designed, or been removed from, a wider setting, but it is possible to see the lobed tip of the tail, which has come up over the back from between the hind legs. The central mask head is roughly triangular in

shape with coarsely engraved features and an extremely long chin. In the upper row, the two stones on the left represent two goats shown in similar posture to the lions, with heads down and front legs stretched forward, but one seems to have been reset at the wrong angle, so that it shows as if reared upwards. It is possible that they were originally intended to have been placed immediately above or below the lions, repeating their confronted position. The pointed horns and long, three stranded beards are extremely recognisable. The remaining three stones have a diaper pattern, like that on some of the Durham capitals and other early tympana of the group; the carvings are all in a very shallow relief, with slightly rounded edges raising them from the background, and the two stones of the lions have a panelled effect. The theme of human figure, or mask head, with two confronted predatory beasts (here stressed by the additional head in one lion's mouth) is also seen at Leckhampstead; and while being related to the Daniel-Gilgamesh motif of east Mediterranean art, seems to have reached Britain well before the Conquest.

St. Sepulchre's, Northampton (49) The church was built between 1108 and 1116, being modelled on that of the Holy Sepulchre, Jerusalem; the carving which is now let into the west portion of the wall of the round was probably the tympanum of the small doorway in the outer wall of the

chancel or of a narrow window. It represents a central human figure with a dragon on his left, and a smaller human on his right. The dragon is shown in a reared up position, so that the long heavy tail, on which it is sitting, makes a frame for the lower part of the tympanum. The head is in profile, with long pointed jaws and tongue, which are biting at the man's face; the ear is pricked and behind it is a small ridge. The legs, immediately below the neck clutch at the victim's arm, the lower leg ending in a hand-like paw. A wing, with parallel engraved lines, hangs down and forwards, and there are two bands which go across the body, one immediately below the wing, and the other on the middle of the tail. The central figure has a beard, and holds some sort of weapon; the other human figure, considerably smaller, is also attacking him with a club, and perhaps the scene is meant to represent the torments of the damned, the dragon here appearing in its most satanic significance. The relief is fairly deep, and well modelled, and the involved figures are ingeniously fitted into the narrow tympanum shape.

St. John's, Ulgham, Northumberland (51). A carved stone has been let into the interior east wall of the north aisle of the modern church; it had been in the sill of one of the windows. The shape suggests that it might have been the tympanum of a narrow doorway, or a window. The stone

shows two human figures, one of which is on horseback, and two birds. On the left, one figure stands facing the front, with small featureless head, angular shoulders, bent arms and wearing a long skirted garment; for this reason it might be meant for a woman, but some of the saints in the Anglo-Norman group are also shown with long tunics. Advancing towards this figure are a horse and rider, seen in profile and outline only, the rider's legs jutting out between the front legs of the horse, one of which is bent forward at the joint. The horse has a long, squared muzzle, and both pricked ears are shown. The tail is very long and hangs down behind the slightly bent hind legs. The rider's body is shown as if seen from the front, with shoulders squared, and two bent arms; in the front hand, he holds up a sword. Between the horse and the standing figure, are two birds, facing the left, one behind the other. There is no indication of wings or feet; they are like two large ducks floating on a pond. There is virtually no relief on this carving, the outlines are achieved by broadly incised lines, and the whole effect is coarse and primitive. The angularity of the horse and rider recalls the style at Whippingham; other riders occur at Kedleston and Linton. The subject is cryptic, and has no immediate reference to Christian iconography, although the significance seems to be a narrative one. Possibly there is some reference to a Norse legend intended, which would also be valid in a Christian context,

as on the pre-Conquest cross sculpture of the north of England.

Holy Trinity, Everton, Notts. (52). The tower, nave and west door date from the early Norman period, to which the tympanum now over the south door but formerly over the doorway in the west face of the tower can also be related. It represents the confronted heads and necks of two horse-like animals. They have cropped manes, marked by vertically incised lines, which grow along the upper edge of the neck to the ear; the necks are long and arched, and the two large pricked ears are shown growing side by side. The eyes, set high in the forehead, are marked by angular incised lines. The head on the right is slightly higher than the other; it has a long thin tongue which curves up past the tip of the other's nose, and ends in a three pointed tuft. The lower head also has an open mouth with protruding tongue, which seems to be forked, and does not extend beyond the jaws. The animals can hardly be described as sculptured, as the outlines are merely engraved, and there is no degree of relief. The upper border of the tympanum is engraved with a zigzag line, possibly in an attempt to imitate more elaborate chevron ornament. The theme is unusual in that only the head and neck of the animal is shown; this is also the case at Barton Segrave

and Cricklade. Also, the treatment is fairly naturalistic, as opposed to the more fantastic nature of the heads and necks at Great Salkeld and Selham. The confronted position and protruding tongues are characteristic of the period, and the extreme flatness would suggest that the artist had been working from a two-dimensional model. Perhaps the tympanum was originally painted.

St. Michael's, Hoveringham, Notts. (53) The reset tympanum of the north door, with a mixture of Norman and Early English traits represents St. Michael and the dragon, while the lintel shows a group of interlaced animals. The dragon faces the left, where the saint is shown in profile, with wings raised and holding up a sword and a kite-shaped shield. Above him is the *Dextera Dei*, and to the far left the *Agnus Dei*, with tail between the legs and up onto the back. The dragon's mouth is open, with a protruding tongue, divided into three ridged sections, and it has a pointed tooth in the upper and lower jaw; the eye is large and almond shaped, almost filling the bulging forehead in which it is set, and behind it is a very small ear. The neck is patterned with rows of engraved scalloped lines to indicate the scales, as is the rest of the body and the inner section of the tail. The legs are shown in a striding position, the nearer leg raised up beneath the chin, and the other stretched back along the

ground; they are both very thin and end in long three-toed claws. Two extended wings are shown, one growing down in front of the body, behind the raised claw, and the other curving up over the back. The shorter upper wing feathers are shown, and the longer feathers indicated by lightly engraved parallel lines. From beyond the wings to the tip of the tail, the body is double-outlined. The tail loops around and over itself, forming a figure-of-eight shape with the rest of the body. Immediately above the head is another much smaller dragon, whose body crosses the tail of the other, and forms another figure-of-eight of its own, becoming interlaced with the wing and tail tips of the large dragon. Its upper jaw ends in a tusk like tooth which overlaps the lower jaw. It has only one small claw, and no wings; the body has the same outlining and scaly marking as the other. These two animals are surrounded in tendrils of interlace enmeshing and growing out of their bodies, and the whole effect, with the surface patterning and double outlining is one of great richness, the elaborate entwined theme being most skilfully handled.

On the lintel are two dragons back to back, the right hand one confronting a human-headed creature with two paws, a wing and a long tail looping round behind itself and back under the body. The dragons are of the same type as the

upper one on the tympanum, without wings, but with extended tails, curving round and back towards the head, and the body with double outlining, enmeshed with fine interlace. The one on the left turns its head back to bite at the tip of the tail, and in the upper jaw the enlarged tusk-like tooth points back towards the eye; while the other has a snout which bends upwards.

The relief is shallow, and the raised surfaces themselves flat. Although the dragons are basically of the same type, the two pairs fit admirably into their differently shaped frames. The two on the lintel have their tails extended horizontally, and bent back on themselves, each forming a pleasing pattern individually, while the pair are given a unity by the extra wreathed lines linking them together, and the third creature copies the raised paw position of the dragon it confronts. On the tympanum however, the pattern is carried upwards, by the strong diagonal line of the tail, and the smaller dragon above fits admirably into the semi-circular shape. The carving cannot be dated in its architectural context, as it is obviously earlier than the doorway. But it compares very closely with that at Southwell, which can be dated to the early twelfth century. While the treatment of the dragons is Scandinavian, in particular the double outlining, the large tooth in the upper jaw, the

looped tails and the thin lines of interlace, there is every sign that the carving was done in the Anglo-Norman period. The saint and dragon on the tympanum is characteristic as well as the addition of Agnus Dei, and a carved lintel is frequently associated with the tympanum. Also, the lintel animals show an attempt, although not entirely successful, at the confronted pair which was also so common of the period; and the shallow relief is typical of the phase. This is the work of a sculptor who, although trained to the Scandinavian style, is here adapting it to an entirely Anglo-Norman context.

The Minster, Southwell, Notts. (54) The main phase of Norman building was in the first quarter of the twelfth century, and to this period can be ascribed the carved stone over the doorway in the north transept. By its shape, it seems to have been a gabled lintel rather than a tympanum. In the very centre is St. Michael, facing the front, with both wings extended above his back, holding up his sword in the right hand, and fending off the dragon with the round shield held in the left hand. The dragon is very similar to that at Hoveringham, with identical treatment of head, wing, body decoration and surrounding strands of interlace ending in leafy scrolls. The only points of difference are that the smaller dragon above its head is absent, that the diagonal extension of the tail passes behind instead of in front of the body, and that the delicate front claw is not raised. The similarity of

ment and of the involved design makes it possible that Southwell and Hoveringham were carved by the same hand and their proximity increases this likelihood although the difference in the shield types is curious. The figures to the left of the saint at Southwell are inspired by a fully Romanesque iconography, and show the duality of sources that could exist in the Anglo-Norman period. They represent a kneeling David, forcing open the mouth of the lion, while above it stands the rescued lamb. The David and lion motif, with an ancient east Mediterranean origin is common in the Romanesque period, and can be seen on the tympanum at Highworth, foreshadowing those at Brinsop and Ruardean. Here, the carver, although strictly following such a model, has not entirely managed to erase the Scandinavian origins of his technique. The long muzzle of the lion, the tooth in its jaw and the ridge at the tip of the nose are all dragon like, as are the long bent claws; and although the tail is shown conventionally down between the hind legs and up over the back, it is looped behind one more leg than is necessary, falling into the familiar manner of interlace; the Hoveringham Agnus has not such an elaborate tail, but resembles this "lion" more closely than the conventional Anglo-Norman lamb.

The carving is done in the same very shallow relief, with a flat surface, but the surface patterning of the

gon's body and the folds of the saint's gown again gives an impression of two-dimensional richness. The sculptor is not necessarily a Scandinavian; the Midlands area of the Danelaw could have provided the survival of the tradition, and the sloping planes of some of the interlace suggests a prototype in wood; but the iconography of David and lion, and Saint and Dragon, and their use on tympana and lintels is of the Anglo-Norman period, and there is no reason why Southwell and Hoveringham should not belong to it.

St. Michael & All Angels, Clifton Hamden, Oxon. (55)

In the outside of the north wall has been reset a rectangular carved stone, which was probably the lintel of the Anglo-Norman church. It shows a row of three animals and a human figure, possibly representing a hunt scene. On the left, a boar faces the centre, recognisable by the short curly tail and the large round body; the stone is broken around the mouth, but there appears to be the tip of an engraved tusk. The boar is walking forward, with its head slightly bent, while another animal which is facing it bites at its ear. This creature might be a hound; it has a longer neck and thinner body than the boar, and the front legs and lower part of the hind legs are broken away. Behind it stands a small human figure who is hardly taller than the animal's back, holding its curved tail in his hands. He faces the front, and has a

and much too large for the rest of the body; the arms and hands are minute and grip the tail from the top. Beyond the human, facing the boar, is another large hound-like animal running forward; it has particularly long ears, but they are not quite long enough to be regarded as goat's horns. Below the body of the boar is a small mask like head, possibly human rather than animal. The carving is done in a fairly deep relief which stands out sharply from the background, although the raised surfaces themselves are smooth, with little hint of moulding. The boar being attacked by hounds and huntsmen is also seen in this phase on lintels at Little Langford and Tutbury Priory; and the human figure holding the curved tail is perhaps a misunderstanding of the huntsman, as at Little Langford or Kedleston, who is shown with a curved hunting horn. The treatment of the boar, in the rounded outline and smooth wide body is like that at Ashford; the horned animal is perhaps intended for a deer, the other common hunt scene victim, as at Durham.

St. Olave's, Fritwell, Oxon. (56) A church was known on the site from c. 1100, and the tympanum over the south door can be ascribed to this phase. It represents two animals confronted before a central 'tree', which is in fact a sprig of foliage, with a small curled leaf on either side, reminiscent of the dividing sprigs between the pairs of animal on the Tapestry and at Ely. The animals are

identical, with the feline trait of tail bending down between the hind legs and up over the back, ending in a spiral tip, but the bodies are otherwise more thickset than the normal lion or feline. The heads are large, with long, thick curved jaws with a trace of double outlining, and grooves to represent the teeth. The eyes are oval, set high in the bulge of the forehead, and there is no ear shown. The tongues bend right up on either side of the central sprig ending each in three lozenge shaped leaves. All four short thick legs end in solid looking claws, and slope forward, so that the body seems to be leaning back. The relief is not deep, but the raised surfaces stand out quite distinctly from the background. On the lintel is a scroll of foliage as at Beckford, but here with much deeper relief. The scene closely resembles that at Swarkestone, where the heavy confronted animals are of the same type, while the rounded jaws and upcurving tongues are also like the confronted heads at Everton. The leaves of the tongues, ingeniously extended to look like the top of the tree, are like those at Leckhampstead and Durham, and confirm the date of before 1100 for this carving.

Kencott, Oxon. (57) The chancel arch and south doorway are the earliest surviving part of the church. The tympanum of the door represents a centaur shooting an arrow into the mouth of a dragon, which is only shown by its head. The centaur faces the right; the head

seen in profile, with short hair and beard, while the shoulders and arms are seen from the front. The lower body is that of a horse, with rather short legs, shown sloping forward, and a long thick tail, engraved at the tip with parallel lines. Behind the head is inscribed: 'Sagittarius'. The arrow, which has just been shot from the bow, is shown in the dragon's open mouth, apparently wedged between the teeth in the upper and lower jaw. The head is enormously large in proportion to the centaur, with an almond-shaped eye in the upper part of the forehead, one pricked ear, and scalloped lines running down the neck to indicate scales. The relief is very shallow, and the raised surfaces completely flat, giving a two-dimensional effect; while the inscription and the use of the head to symbolise the whole, as at Beckford, where the dragon's mouth represented Hell, suggests the use of a manuscript prototype.

St. Michael's, Newton Purcell, Oxon. (58) The tympanum over now the south but formerly over the north door is elaborately carved on the lower part with scalloped and foliate patterns, but above these are a bird and a snake. The bird is shown in a flying position, turned to the left. The beak is small, the body long and straight, and the legs not indicated; the tail and wing, raised above the back, are wedge shaped, and engraved with parallel lines. The upper tip of the tail is being nibbled by the head of the snake, whose body is seen in

a knot of angular coils, very thin and of a uniform width. The relief is shallow and barely rises from the surface; the general effect is not very successful, as the elaborate surface patterns tend to obscure the two animals, who are tucked away at the top in the same way as the deer and bird at Sandwich, and do not seem relevant to the rest of the design. The treatment of the wing, in the abrupt way it grows from the body, shape and feather treatment is like that at Eggleton. The knotted snake finds parallels in the pre-Conquest carving of Man.

Salford, Oxon. (59) The tympanum of the north door has a central medallion containing a cross, on the left of it a centaur and on the right a lion. The upper part of the centaur is turned to the front, with the features of the face roughly indicated, and the inner arm bent at the elbow to touch the waist, while the outer arm is extended, holding a bow as if to shoot over his shoulder. The front far leg is raised to touch the rim of the medallion, and this position is echoed by the lion, whose wide head is also shown facing the front. The hind far paw is raised, so that it seems to be striding forward; the tail curves up over the back, and ends in a large leafy tip. The relief is gently rounded. Although the centaur's body faces the front, the backward looking position of the bow is significant, and is here an example of the artist

standing his sources, whereas at Stoke-sub-Hamden the lion's body is turned away from the lion, so that when the upper part looks back, the bow is pointing at the victim. The use of the central medallion between two confronted animals is also seen at Bondleigh, Eggleton and Little Bytham, and the cross or Agnus Dei seem to be interchangeable symbols within it.

Llanbadarn Fawr, Radnor (60). Only the south door and font of the Norman church survive; the tympanum represents a tree growing out of an animal mask, confronted by a pair of felines, which are not entirely identical, as that on the left has a squatter body and shorter legs than the other. They have rounded faces with two pricked ears, side by side, pointed noses and small, open mouths. The one on the left is shown in a reared up position, so that both front paws almost touch the trunk of the tree, the lower paw resting on the ear of the animal mask. The tails bend between the hind legs and up over the back, ending in tips like a fleur de lis. Below the body of the one on the left is a round object with rosette markings. The animal mask is that of a feline, with wideset pointed ears, between which the trunk of the tree grows straight up, with a short curled branch on either side. The relief is quite deep, so that the figures stand clearly from the background. On the right hand capital of the doorway is a small quadruped with long muzzle and tail pointing

upward.

The theme of confronted felines by a central tree is one of the most characteristic in the Anglo-Norman group. This carving appears to be quite late in the phase, by the depth of the relief, by the elaboration of the tail tips, and the distortion in the figures themselves; they are confronted, but not truly identical. The tree, whose curling side branches recall those at Fritwell, growing out of the animal mask is an elaborate touch, and the rosette adds further symbolism. These occur sporadically in the group, at Whitwell and Ridlington, in association with felines, and in profusion at the rather later Downe St. Mary, Devon.

St. Edmund's, Egleton, Rutland (61). The church dates from soon after the Conquest, and the chancel arch and south door survive from this first period of building. The tympanum of the south door represents a central six-petalled rosette surrounded by cable moulding, on either side of which are a feline and a dragon shown standing at right angles to the lintel, and holding in their mouths another strip of cable moulding which grows over the top of the rosette pattern. The feline on the left is seen in profile; it has long jaws, the upper curling round on itself at the tip, two pricked ears growing side by side and an arched neck. The slender legs have bird-like claws with three toes, one in the centre

and one growing from each side. The tail bends down between the legs and up over the back almost touching the back of the head, and ending in a lozenge shaped tip. On the right, the dragon has the round head and beak of a bird, but with two sharp ears. The neck widens where the wing and legs join the body, which then narrows into a tail turning at a right angle away from the body, and looping around itself. One wing grows abruptly from the body, and feathers behind it suggest the second wing. The legs are thin and end in the same bird-like claws as the feline. The whole body as well as the wing is marked with lightly engraved parallel lines. The relief is not deep, but the outlines are gently moulded. The whole composition is admirably suited to the shape of the tympanum, with the rosette filling the main central area, and the animals fitted into the triangular shapes on either side, linked to each other by the cable in their mouths and by their feet gripping the inner cable. The theme of confronted animals by a central circular frame is a frequent one, the rosette, which elsewhere appears as a small additional symbol, here taking the main position of the cross or Agnus Dei. On the lintel, there is a pattern of Ringerike-like foliage.

St. Mary & St. Andrew's, Ridlington, Rutland (62). A church is mentioned in the Domesday Survey; the tympanum now over

the door at the west end of the south aisle was found during restorations in the south wall of the chancel, and probably dates from this early Norman period. It represents a confronted lion and griffin, with a small rosette symbol below the body of the lion. The griffin is on the left; it has the hind claws, ears and almond shaped eye of a feline, and the rounded head, beak and front claws of a bird, a combination quite frequent in the Tapestry. One wing grows from the near side front leg, and the tip of the other is seen over the back, both incised with parallel lines to indicate the feathers. The tail, which is thin, bends down between the hind legs and up over the back, ending in a forked tip. The near front paw is raised and touched by the lion's front paw, both of which are lifted in the air, so that it seems to be prancing. The mouth is open, both ears are pricked, and there is a large engraved eye; from a collar-like line around the neck grow the four curls of the mane, bending up at the tip like some of those on the Tapestry. The tail goes between the legs and up across the back, ending in a large leafy tip pointing towards the head, and it is much wider than that of the griffin. The relief is low and has gently rounded edges. The confronted animals are depicted with some vigour, and the controlled style and general resemblance to the animals on the Tapestry suggesting

That the carving is quite early in the group, makes it not impossible that the same hand carved Ridlington and the equally early Eggleton.

Priory Church, Much Wenlock, Shropshire (63). The priory was founded c. 1080, and the church was known to be in existence by 1101. The carving over the blocked doorway at the east end of the south wall seems to belong to this phase, and was probably a lintel of one of the doors of the church. It represents two dragons confronted before a central animal mask, the dragons extended in a crouching position. They have heads rather like boars, with long squared muzzles and one large ear each; there is a beaded line like a collar round the neck, and also a line of beaded moulding which runs down the length of the body to the tail. One short leg is shown for each, leaning slightly forward, with no particular indication of feet. The tail of the left dragon is broken, but that of the right one ends in an animal head, placed upside down, and apparently biting at the curve of the body; it is a bird-shaped head and beak, but has two thin ears, and compares with the smallest head of the three-headed dragon on the font at Thrope Arnold (64). Between the two, raised a little above the almost touching muzzles, is a triangular face with wideset ears, round eyes, their centres marked by dots, and a moustache like mouth. The relief is slightly rounded.

The use of single animal masks is seen at Durham, Dumbleton and Llanbadarn Fawr, and masks between confronted animals at Barton Segrave and Bramber; the tail ending in an animal head is not unusual in the group and is a particular characteristic of the dragon.

St. Mary's, Stottesdon, Shropshire (65). The church can be ascribed to a very early phase of Norman building, to which the tympanum and lintel of the west doorway also belong. On the broad lintel are three felines in a row, two of which are upside down - or possibly the lintel has been set the wrong way up. The feline on the extreme right is the one at present the right way up; its body is turned inward with its head facing the front. The ears are wideset, and the facial features clearly shown. All four legs bend slightly forward at the joint so as to give a crouching impression, the hind legs ending in three-toed claws, the front legs indistinct, while the tail hangs stiffly down. The two other animals are shown with bodies confronted, and front legs bent sharply forward, almost touching, all legs ending in the three-toed claw. But the head of the central animal faces the front, while the other is in profile, and the tail of the former curves down between the legs and up over the back, in the conventional feline manner, while the latter's bends sharply up. The tympanum above consists of

even stones, with a diaper pattern, which have obviously not been carved in situ, and at their apex is a bearded mask head with staring eyes.

Apart from the architectural date, the primitive style and technique suggests a place very early in the phase. There is no attempt at relief, but the figures stand out very faintly from the background. The use of three animals in a row is satisfactory for a lintel design, but the upside-down one is cryptic, and may be compared with that at Whitwell. The confronted pair are not identical, as if the artist had been copying a similar pair without understanding why, and other examples of wrong copying are the front legs which bend forward at the joint, and the fact that a feline with its head turned to the front and body in profile is almost always given the tail curling between the legs and up over the back. However, this position on the other feline, the confused attempt at the confronted pair, and the three toes claws do place the carvings within the Anglo-Norman group, while the mask and diapering of the tympanum are also characteristic of the period.

Holy Trinity, Uppington, Shrops. (66) The church seems to have had several twelfth century phases of building, and the tympanum of the north doorway seems to date from the very beginning of the century. It represents a dragon facing the left, open mouthed, with a row of teeth in the upper jaw,

and a pointed fang at the end of the lower. The eye is oval and engraved, and the single ear pointed. The neck joins the upper part of the back of the head, so that there is a rounded swelling where the chin should be. The arched neck is at first narrow, but widens to where the legs join the body; these are bent forward at the joint, and end in three toes. On the upper body is a raised wing, indicated by engraved parallel lines. Across the wing is the V-shaped pattern made by the entwined tail tip with another strand of interlace; the tail loops down and under itself, then forms a great oval shape beneath the body, interspersed with a number of circular loops, terminating in the V-shape above the back. The relief is extremely shallow, and the effect of the carving two-dimensional. The stylised treatment of the tail finds no exact parallels in the Anglo-Norman group, although there are similar ornamental loops at Kingswinford, but not on such a large scale. The extremely elaborate effect produced by the basically rather clumsy treatment is the converse of that at Hoveringham and Southwell; there the Scandinavian trained sculptor was trying to fit his beautiful dragons into an Anglo-Norman scheme of decoration. Here the dragon, which is typically Anglo-Norman in the treatment of jaws, legs and wing has its tail elaborated in an unsuccessful attempt at ornamental interlace of the Scandinavian type, which requires a far more sophisticated linear treatment than a series of loops.

.. Andrew's, Wroxeter, Shropshire (67). A church was in existence by Domesday; the carved slab incorporated into a plinth on the south side of the chancel arch, which dates from the twelfth century may date from this earlier phase. The stone is rectangular in shape, and seems to have been a lintel. It is carved with three birds in a row, one confronted pair, while the bird on the far right faces inward. The outlines are simple, and the bodies are held almost parallel to the line of the ground, rather than standing upright, like so many on the Tapestry. They have round heads, short necks, no sign of the wing, and wedge shaped tails; two thin legs each are shown, but with no indication of claws. In the two spaces between the three birds are two S-shaped creatures, worm or snake rather than dragon, which the birds are leaning down to peck at; the bird on the right also has a small sprig of foliage in its beak. The relief is very flat. In their plainness of outline, they resemble the birds at Kensworth and Bramber, rather than those of the Tapestry with large claws and feathers, although the foliage in the beak is a common Tapestry motif. There is possibly some special significance attached to the association of three birds, as these also occur at Stoke-sub-Hamden and Little Langford, while a row of three creatures, with two confronted is that seen at Stottesdon.

St. Michael's, Flax Bourton, Somerset (68). The carved

stone over the south door of the twelfth century church represents the saint and dragon in combat. The saint is shown standing on the dragon's prostrate body, turned to the front, with wings extended, and in the right hand a cross-headed sword or possibly cross, which is being plunged straight down into the upturned mouth of the dragon. The tunic has simple lines to represent the folds of the drapery. The dragon is shown lying on its side, the head turned round and up, with open jaws, to receive the sword point, and having one small tooth in the upper jaw. The eye is round, with an inner circle, and the two ears are rather narrow. The body is shown lying on the side, with the underpart turned to the front, so that both front paws are shown. The wing is just raised above the body with three parallel lines engraved to indicate the feathers; the tail loops round and straight upwards, and has a central spine of beaded moulding. The relief is not very deep. This version of the saint and dragon combat has more in common with Hallaton, in that the saint is shown having conquered, and standing triumphantly on top of the dragon, which is again shown on its side, with its head to the right, while the sword being thrust straight down into the mouth derives from manuscript sources, as at Beckford, where the head is used on its own. The beaded moulding down the centre of the body is like that on the dragons of Much Wenlock.

St. John's, Milborne Port, Somerset (69). The church can be dated to within a few years after the Conquest, having very early architectural traits, and the tympanum of the south door belongs to this first phase of building. It represents a pair of confronted lions, not in exactly identical positions, as that on the left looks backward to bite the tip of its tail, while the other has its head in forward profile, with the tongue protruding to touch the pricked ears of the other lion, an ingenious effect to give symmetry.

The tongue itself ends in a trilobate tip, while the ears of both lions are shown one behind the other, with some sense of perspective, unlike most of the ears in the group. The manes grow from a line across the neck in a row of four lobed curls; that on the left has one row of curls, the other has two, one above the other, both of these finding parallels in the lions of the Tapestry. The bodies are rounded and sturdy, the legs slender, ending in delicate three-toed claws, and the tails curve down between the hind legs and up over the back, ending in leaf-like pointed tips. The hind legs of each are widely splayed, recalling those of the lion at Ampney St. Mary. The almond shaped eyes, mouths, ears and mane curls all have a double outline lightly engraved, and the upper edges of the front legs are also indicated as thin lines on the body. The upper border of the tympanum is marked by a scroll of delicate foliage.

The carving shows a masterly hand, and is one of the most accomplished in the Anglo-Norman group. The relief stands out distinctly although not deeply from the flat background; the outlines of the figures are on a sloping plane, and the raised surfaces are very gently rounded, contrasting with the more engraved technique used to indicate the features. The meticulous detail, the use of the double outlining and the treatment of the mane suggest a manuscript prototype, quite apart from the foliage pattern of the border; but at the same time, it is a fully sculptural adaptation of the theme, the relief being more than mere engraving or a chiselled out background, while the positioning of the animals, with the extended tongue marking the high central point, and the flattened hind legs extending into the corners, is completely suited to the semicircular shape. Apart from the architectural evidence for a very early date, the lions may also be closely compared to many on the Tapestry, to those at Ely, with a similar two-dimensional origin, and also similar animals at Jumieges, derived from a manuscript source.

The capitals of the doorway are also carved; that on the west has a mask with three foliate tongues protruding from the mouth, a similar motif to that at Dumbleton; the capital on the east has the west and south faces carved with a warrior, seen in profile, although with shoulders turned to the front, holding a Norman shield and a sword, and wearing a short tunic,

in combat with what appears to be a griffin. This is on the adjacent face, and is turned to the warrior; it has a horse-like body, with legs which end in hooves, the far front leg raised, and the extended wing engraved with parallel lines. The tail comes up over the back and ends in a spiral tip. Possibly this pair are meant to represent the combat of saint and dragon, for griffins are otherwise in the Anglo-Norman group never shown fighting, but only occur in confronted pairs, of which the raised fore leg is an attribute.

St. Andrew's, Stogursey, Somerset (70). The church was in existence by 1100, and the carved capitals of the crossing and chancel arch are contemporary with this early Norman phase. The carvings show a mixture of animal and foliage motifs, as in the other early capital groups of Durham and Ely, and give an impression of a great richness of ornament and considerable skill on the part of the carvers. On the east capital of the north arch of the crossing is a crouched feline with only one leg to represent each pair, an early trait, seen also at Durham and Shirley, head raised with mouth open, and the tail which curls over the back, ending in a leafy tip. On the east face of the west capital is an angular mask head between the volutes, closely reminiscent of one in the crypt at Gloucester Cathedral, c.1089, with parallels in Normandy. (71) The east capital of the south

arch has all three faces decorated with an elaborate scheme of two pairs of dragons, alternately confronted and adorsed. The central, wide face contains one pair, back to back, with their long tails entwined; the wing is shown in three transverse segments, pointing straight upwards, and the single leg, ending in a three-toed claw hangs down. The heads are those of birds, with small rounded eye and beak; they are placed where the volute should be, and almost merge into those of the dragons on the two side faces of the capital. A sprig of foliage fills the space between the confronted bodies of each pair.

The same motifs are used to decorate the three faces of the north capital of the chancel arch, with the identical scheme of two pairs of dragons. There is a slight difference of treatment, in that the wings are shown more simply, engraved all the way up with parallel lines, and the legs are shown crouching forward rather than hanging down. The heads touch beneath the volutes. These linked motifs on the different faces are ideally suited to capital decoration, and the placing of the individual animals within the face is perfectly adapted, so that the extended wing tip touches the upper border, and the front paws and foliage spring between them are a good design for the angle of the capital. The carvings stand out from their background, and are faintly moulded, the whole group showing considerable sophistication and accomplishment.

St. Mary's, Stoke-sub-Hamden, Somerset (72). The reset tympanum of the north door represents a central tree in whose branches sit three birds, one at the top, turned to the left and the other two perched vertically facing the trunk; all three have the body decorated with diagonally engraved lines. This is also used on the upper body of the centaur, which is to the left of the tree, turning outwards, but with the head looking back to fire an arrow across the path of the tree at the lion on the other side of it. The lion is also shown facing outwards, with the legs extended, as if rapidly walking away from its pursuer. The head is shown in profile, with an extremely short, squared muzzle, thin pointed tongue, and two large triangular ears, growing side by side, with a trace of double outlining. Rows of scallops on the neck suggest the mane, and the tail bends between the hind legs and up over the back, but not extending beyond it. Above the lion, facing the tree is a small Agnus Dei, balancing a simple cross on its bent fore leg. The relief of the carving is extremely shallow; engraved on the curve of the border beside the centaur is 'SAGITARIUS' and on the lintel below the lion 'LEO'. There is a fascinating confusion of symbols in the tympanum; the combination of lion and centaur is not unusual being also seen at Salford; and the inscriptions relating them to the Zodiac symbols are also seen beside the centaurs at Kencott and Hook Norton. But two animals adorsed before a central

tree should ideally be identical; and the tree itself with the three birds in the branches may be compared to that at Little Langford, which stands on its own. Finally, the placing of the Agnus Dei over the lion adds further symbolism - possibly the lion is meant to represent good, which is being threatened by the arrow of the centaur-archer.

Over a window in the exterior north wall of the nave is a carving of St. Michael and the dragon; the slab is rectangular, but shaped to fit the curve of the window, and therefore seems to be contemporary. The dragon is shown with body turned to the left, but head looking back at the saint; its long tail forms a frame for the carving, like that at Northampton, extending along the ground, and bending up beyond the saint. It has two small legs, ending in two-toed claws, and a rudimentary wing, closely engraved with parallel lines. Its mouth is open, with a long protruding tongue which it darts at the saint. He is shown facing the front, wearing trousers, and holding two weapons: a spear, which he thrusts horizontally at the dragon's neck, and a sword which he waves in the air. The whole carving is extremely primitive and clumsy in style, done in a flat relief; and the two weapons of the saint instead of the more conventional shield and sword or spear suggest that the artist has no particular prototype in mind, but is merely seeking to illustrate the combat. It does not appear to be by the same hand as the tympanum, which, although not a very accomplished piece

of work, is in a rather different style. Possibly by the carver of the saint and dragon are two more animals on the buttress ends of the exterior north wall, which show a variety of decorative motifs; the animals are both of the same type, quadrupeds in profile, with long stiff legs and straight tails, with two long ears, or possibly horns, growing from the back of the head. The bodies resemble that of the single animal at Darley Dale in general rigidity and relief, and it is impossible to say whether rabbits, goats or deer are intended.

Ipstones, Staffs. (73) A carved stone, which has once been a tympanum is let into the south wall of the nave. It represents confronted wingless dragons in combat, reared up and supported by their angularly knotted tails. The legs are clawing at each other, the paws having long curved nails, that of the dragon on the left clawing the other's chin. The head of the former is higher than the other, and its open jaws appear about to snap at the tip of the other's nose. Its tail ends in a bird-like head, as do those of the dragons at St. Bees, Much Wenlock and Newton in Cleveland. The general style is clumsy, the heads and upper parts seeming too heavy for the dwindling tails, whose loops are contrived and stiff rather than achieving the effortless interlace of the more Scandinavian types. And although the animals are of the same type, and confronted, they are not entirely identical; the

significance of the confronted position is obscured by their combat.

St. Michael's, Kingswinford, Staffs. (74) The carved tympanum was originally over the south door, and is now placed over the interior doorway at the west end of the aisle. It represents the combat between St. Michael and the dragon. The saint is standing on the left, facing the front, with both extremely long wings raised, that on the right extending sideways, and forming an upper frame for the group. The treatment of his long tunic is elaborate, and the wing feathers also are shown in three transverse rows. In the right hand, he holds the top of a mushroom hilted sword, while clutching under the arm a round shield with an embossed rim. The sword is being thrust straight down into the open mouth of the dragon, which crouches at his feet. Its head is held right up, with open, rounded jaws and two rows of pointed teeth which grip the sword as it disappears down the throat. The mouth is double outlined, the eye is represented by a small dot, and the ear flattened within the outline of the neck, whose scalloped underside suggests scales. The back is arched, and the single leg comes forward across the neck to touch the back of the head with a long claw. The wing is not raised, but follows the line of the body, the feathers being divided into several transverse sections, like those of the saint's wing. The tail bends up over the body

and back on itself toward the head, in three small loops with a central beaded spine; this is a possible prototype for the elaborate but meaningless loops at Uppington. The relief is not deep, but shows a certain amount of moulding. The position of the saint stabbing the sword downwards is like that at Flax Bourton, and shows the victory, as opposed to the combat with the spear; and the defensive shield is not necessary here, the round Anglo-Saxon type suggesting derivation from a manuscript.

St. Mary the Virgin, Tutbury Priory, Staffs. (75) The foundation of the church can be securely dated to not later than 1089, and the carved lintel of the south door belongs to the earliest phase of building, although the door itself dates from the later twelfth century. The carving represents a boar hunt: on the extreme right stands a large boar, recognisable by its bristled back and knotted tail, which is being attacked by three hounds. One crouches on the ground to bite at the boar's foreleg, and the other two bite at its lower and upper jaws respectively. The animals are all shown with only leg to represent each pair. To the extreme left is a now obliterated figure, which is said to have represented a horse and rider. The carving stands out from its flat background on a slightly moulded plane. It gives an impression of vigour and movement, and the figures are well placed to fit their rectangular frame.

St. Nicholas, Ipswich, Suffolk (76). Carvings of the Anglo-

Norman period have been incorporated into the later church. Two, most probably by the same hand, represent a boar, and the combat between St. Michael and the dragon; the former was the tympanum of a blocked doorway, and the latter is on a stone let into the wall. The boar stands facing the right, with the neck bent down, in a grazing or threatening position. The mouth is slightly open, and from the upper jaw, which curves up into a small spiral tip, two tusks grow down to cross the lower. The eye is almond shaped, with the pointed end towards the nose. One ear is shown, pricked and triangular, and from its base a grooved line of bristle runs the length of the back, ending in the spirally curled tail. The junction of both front and hind legs with the body is indicated by engraved spiral lines, which divide from a single point to join the top of each leg. The legs are long and thin, bent slightly at the joint, and end in long, delicate, two-toed claws. There is some patterning on the body, a series of curved engraved lines ending in dots. The use of the joint spiral, curved snout and spiral tail do not otherwise occur in the Anglo-Norman group, and this boar is quite different from those of Tutbury, Ashford and Hognaston, which have heavy looking, rounded bodies and looped tail. But the use of the boar is quite characteristic of the style; and although the details of treatment at Ipswich are unusual, they are Scandinavian traits which could be applied to any animal, while the use of a boar in shallow relief to decorate a semi-circular tympanum suggests that the carving does indeed belong

to this phase.

The carving of the saint and dragon is of the same type: while certain details are Scandinavian, the choice of subject and general style are Anglo-Norman. The saint is shown on the left with body turned to the front, and feet in profile, and two very small wings raised above the head. He holds up a sword and shield, of the long Norman type seen on the Tapestry, and held by the warrior at Milborne Port and the saint at Hoveringham. The dragon faces him, in a reared up position, as if balancing on the tail. Its mouth is open, the upper jaw curling slightly round, and the protruding tongue has three sharp barbs. A rudimentary wing is shown, engraved with parallel lines, contained more within the outline of the back than rising above it. The front legs, which end in long pointed two-toed claws grow together and are only separated by a thin line which ends in a spiral for the joint. The tail bends down, round and up over itself into the figure of eight shape seen also in the dragons of Southwell and Hoveringham, and not otherwise achieved by the more solid Anglo-Norman dragons. The relief, like that of the boar, is fairly shallow. While the saint is a clumsy figure, the dragon shows considerable grace and mastery of style; the tongue and claws are delicately treated, the spiral joint gives an effect of motion, while the looped tail adds to the lightness of effect. It is not a typical Anglo-Norman dragon, but it is certainly of the Anglo-

Norman period, by the choice of saint and dragon, and particularly by the treatment of the saint and his type of shield; sword and long shield are also seen at Ault Hucknall. The two carvings would seem to be the work of a Scandinavian-trained artist, by the details of joint spiral and curled jaws, but one trying to work in the Anglo-Norman style; they most probably date from before 1100.

St. Mary's, Santon Downham, Suffolk (77). A reset panel over the south door shows a lion, in profile and turned to the right, which has in its mouth the tip of a leafy stem which passes down behind its front leg, and grows from the ground beneath it. The lion has a small delicate head, oval engraved eye, ears growing side by side, with inner triangular excisions, and a trace of double outlining. Four tongue-like curls with a line down the middle grow from the curve of the chin to represent the mane, rather like those of Milborne Port. The legs are long and slender, with a bend at the joints, and end in small neat paws. The tail bends down between the hind legs and up over the back to end in a trilobate tip like that of the associated foliage sprig. The relief is shallow, but slightly moulded; the head seems to stand out further than the neck, and the centres of the ears and mane have deeper incisions than the engraving of the eye. In its position, and particularly the treatment of the mane, it resembles some of the lions in the Tapestry, but shows greater skill in the handling of the

body. The whole effect is graceful and accomplished, and suggests, by the linear quality, some two-dimensional prototype.

All Saint's, Wordwell, Suffolk (78). The church has surviving Norman nave, doors and chancel arch. The tympanum of the south door represents two animals confronting a central tree, enmeshed in its coiling branches and foliage. The animals are perhaps felines; they have open mouths, with squarish muzzles, a single pricked ear each, and seem to be leaping forward, with the front legs crouched, on either side of a tendril, and the hind legs extended. Behind the head, across the body and between the hind legs are spiral coils of interlace, which the tails themselves turn into, growing from the tree, which branches into two at the top, giving an effect of symmetry. The relief is deepish, with rounded edges, and the whole tympanum is a masterly piece of work. The theme of confronted felines and tree is characteristic of the period, but this carving suggests a manuscript prototype, in the trace of double outlining in the faces, and the elaborate treatment of the interlacing branches, which is not so well suited to relief carving. It should be compared to the similar subject at Knook, where the adaptation to sculpture is less successful. Here at least the animals stand firmly on the ground, and the tree trunk is set on the same solid base as that at Ashford, and the open mouthed animals seem to be biting at each other rather than a part of the scroll which they inhabit.

St. Nicholas, Bramber, Sussex (79). The church can be dated securely to 1073, so that the carved south capital of the chancel arch is virtually contemporary with those of Durham Castle Chapel. All three faces are carved, with mask faces taking the place of the volutes, the east and north faces also having raised rectangular projections carved with animals. That on the east face is a feline, placed vertically downwards, with its head looking back to bite at the tip of the tail, which passes between the hind legs and up over the back. The jaws are pointed, and the ears are triangular, growing side by side; the legs are rigid, with no indication of perspective. The volute face of the north east corner is a human mask head confronted by two birds, apparently pecking at it, with both wings raised, slender bodies, again placed vertically, and legs ending in two large toes. The central rectangular area of the north face shows vertically a feline, with tail between the legs, which are at an angle so that it seems to lean forward; and extending on to the lower area of the face the long necked bird which it holds in its mouth upside down so that the bird's feet are in the air. On the west face are another three animals, with a Maltese cross in the far corner. A feline stands, horizontally, in the centre, with an extremely long tail hanging straight down, the stiff legs, triangular ears and pointed jaws of the others; pointing vertically down, as if being dangled from the mouth of the feline, is a bird with a short neck, and long raised wing. Below these two and

upside down is a dragon with a crested head, raised wing and large claws.

The relief of these carvings is shallow, and the surfaces are extremely flat. While the figures do not show any great sculptural accomplishment, they are well placed in their architectural setting, all filling the space allotted to them. The head with confronted birds on the two faces is effective, and the vertical placing of the feline, and feline with bird is suited to their narrow rectangular frames. The latter motif, which is repeated on the west face, recalls two similar types on the Tapestry of the fox making off with a goose; or might possibly refer to the fable of the wolf and crane. The animals do not otherwise resemble those of the Tapestry, the wings and tails of the birds having no indication of feathers, and lacking the distinctive heavy claws, while the stiff legs of the felines are characteristic of a very early style of carving.

St. Andrew's, Jevington, Sussex (80). The tower of the church can be dated to the early Norman period; a sculptured slab found during restoration of the tower and now built into the north wall of the nave can most probably be attributed to this phase. It represents the figure of Christ, with loin cloth and halo and two beasts at his feet, thrusting the cross straight down into the mouth of that on the left. This feline-like animal turns inwards, with its head looking back

and up, open mouthed, with a double outlined jaw; the eye is also outlined, almond shaped, with the pointed end towards the nose. Just behind the single front leg, a double line curves inward like an embryo joint spiral, and the leg ends in four pointed toes, which clutch at a loop of interlace growing from an extension of the hind leg at the bent joint, and forming a kind of knotted platform for the animal to stand on. The tail curves up past the hind leg on to the back, but does not extend beyond it.

On the other side is a snake-like creature; it has the reversed eye and pricked ear of the feline, with double outlining which continues down the sides of the body, but the tip of the upper jaw extends upwards into a spiral point, and a band of interlace grows from the lower jaw to enmesh the body and join with the tail. While the figure of Christ stands out from the background with some degree of moulded relief, the animals are more shallow, and have fairly flat surfaces. The conflicting views on the attribution of the slab arise of the mixture of styles that it shows; the most convincing explanation is that it belongs to the early Norman period. For while the figure of Christ is very like those of the many late Saxon roods, the associated beasts relate it to the Romanesque iconographic motif of Christ trampling the asp and basilisk, while these show the mixed Scandinavian and Anglo-Norman features seen in other carvings of the period: the backward looking position of the animal, with the tail

curled up, not quite successfully, over the back are Anglo-Norman, as is the cross thrust downward into the mouth, in the manner of the saint and dragon - the position seen at Flax Bourton, and at Kingswinford. The Scandinavian traits, in particular the mouth of the snake, the reversed eyes of both, and the uneven interlace can all be attributed to the influence of the Urnes style, which dates, in the British Isles, from the late eleventh to early twelfth century.

St. Peter & St. Paul, Peasmarsh, Sussex (81). The church was in existence by Domesday, and the original nave and chancel arch survive. On the second quoin stone below the impost on each side of the chancel arch is carved a feline, with the body turned in to the arch, but the head looking back. The one on the right is biting the tip of its tail, which bends up and over the back, and its body is patterned with lightly engraved diagonal lines in the manner of those at Durham. The legs are shown curved slightly forward and, again like Durham, do not seem to be supporting the weight of the body. The further front paw is bent right up towards the head, That on the left is looking backward but the tail, similarly bent up, is much shorter and does not reach the muzzle; the legs all end in three toed claws. These felines are carved in an extremely shallow, flat relief, and have a stiff and clumsy look. Their placing

on either side of the arch, but not as capitals of columns is also seen at Cambridge and Netheravon, and may be regarded as a very early phase of the Anglo-Norman style, which the comparison with Durham confirms.

Other early carvings have been reset in the outer walls of the church: on a stone over the priest's doorway in the south wall is another feline, half crouching, with tail coming down between the hind legs and up against the back, but not beyond it, in a rather more rounded relief. At the head of the diagonal buttress supporting the north east angle of the chancel is a bird, seen in profile, with wings raised, and holding a sprig in its beak, like that at Lower Swell; and below the plinth of the buttress at the east end of the south wall is a stag. It is possible that these pieces might have come from a tympanum: bird and stag are associated at Sandwich, and bird, stag and feline at Parwich. The deeper relief suggests that they are later than the felines of the chancel arch.

St. James's, Selham, Sussex (82). The church can be dated to the years around the Conquest, and the carved south capital of the chancel arch, which is not characteristic of the Anglo-Norman group can be regarded as illustrating the survival of pre-Conquest influence. Fitting the corner, in the place of the volute, is a carved animal head with wideset ears and

almond shaped eyes with double outlining; on either side, the cheeks are lightly engraved with diagonal lines, the forehead is domed, and the outlined mouth is gripping a band of interlace which spreads onto the capital faces on each side of the corner. On the left face the neck narrows into a kind of stem, which forms a loose knot around itself, turning into the band gripped by the mouth. This stem has double outlining, and is covered with a dotted pattern. Running at a diagonal to this is another head on a stalk-like body, which ends in a trilobate leafy tail; the head is that of a bird, with an open beak of a mouth, small round eye and collar. The body is similarly dotted, and has an engraved central spine. On the other face are further interlaced patterns. On the impost above, running around both sides, is the looped horizontal body of another creature, with the same dotting and central spine, growing from a head with open mouth and flattened ears. Although the linear, ornamental quality of the carving, unrecognisable animal types and double outlining might suggest a pre-Conquest date, the placing of the head at the corner in deeper relief (cf. Bramber and Durham) and the distorted body patterning to fill the face of the capital belong to the Anglo-Norman style. The impost carving is unusual in the period, but does also occur at Kensworth, while the animal type, a legless, wingless dragon, is that of Great Salkeld; the trilobate leafy tail is seen on many felines of the group, and on the body of the animal on the impost should be compared with the dragons of Kingswinford and Uppington.

Old Parish Church, Alveston, Warwick (83). A church was known at Domesday, and the reset tympana over the west and south doors of the ruined church may date from this phase. The carving over the west door represents two confronted beasts apparently fighting. Their tongues are touching, and the animal on the right raises the foreleg to claw at the other's chin. They both have heavy legs with long clawed feet, thick squarish bodies, and the tail of the one on the left bends down between the hind legs. They are of no particular type; the heads are small and out of proportion with the rest of the body, with a small pricked ear each. Above the pair is a defaced band of carving, which perhaps represented further animal figures. The relief is extremely shallow and flat; the clawing position recalls that at Ipstones, and the tongues touching in combat are also seen at Wynford Eagle and Everton.

The tympanum of the now blocked south door consists of two courses of stones, the lower with a geometric pattern of circles and knots, and in the middle, in bad condition now, a bird, standing up and facing the front with extended wings engraved with parallel lines; it was possibly two headed, and otherwise recalls that at Acton. On the upper row are two confronted animals, more deer-like than the other pair, with slender bodies, long necks and tails bending between the hind legs and up over the back, ending in pointed tips. The heads are raised, and the mouths slightly open. In position and treatment, they recall several of the hound/

feline Tapestry animals. The relief is slightly deeper than that of the west door, and the style rather more accomplished; the two represent different traditions within the Anglo-Norman group - the clumsy monsters in a combat position which tries to copy that of the confronted pairs, which are seen with better understanding on the south door.

St. Margaret & James, Long Marton, Westmoreland (84). The church has several phases of Norman building; the tympana of the west and south doors belong to the very earliest, and date from soon after the Conquest. The west door tympanum is carved with a mermaid on the right and on the left a dragon. The mermaid's body is turned to the right while the upper part is facing the front, grotesquely out of proportion, being very much smaller than the tail. The head is tiny, with dots to represent the features, and no indication of hair; the huge hands, with thumbs most clearly shown, are raised in the orant position. The body bends round into a broad horizontal band, with ridged fins above and below, and the tail forms a thinner knot at the end where there is another fin and a wedge-shaped tip. To the left is the dragon, looking back over its shoulder at the mermaid. The jaws are long, the upper curling slightly at the tip, with a row of jagged teeth and a long pointed tongue. The neck is long and slender; one wing is half raised from the body, with lightly engraved parallel lines,

and there is a single stumpy leg with no indication of claw; the tail terminates in a knot.

Over the south door are another two creatures; on the right, a very similar dragon, backward looking with protruding tongue; this time shown with two wings and two legs, with the body parallel to the line of the ground. By it are the symbols of St. Michael, wings and kite-shaped shield. On the left is a type of centaur, with the body of a quadruped, long straight tail and horse-like legs, but the upper part that of a bird with extended wings, lightly engraved and rounded head and beak set on a narrow neck.

Both carvings are done in an exceptionally shallow and flat-surfaced relief, with only the surface wing and fin engravings to give any variety of texture. The iconography - mermaid, dragon, saint, centaur - is Anglo-Norman, but the treatment suggests uneasy copying by a local sculptor who was not at all familiar with the style. The orant posture of the mermaid is technically correct, and may be compared with those of Durham and Stow Longa, and the centaur of North Cerney, but the huge body, which should be the fish tail, ends itself in a further knotted tail, like those of the dragons. And while the profile head and frontal wings and body are accepted positions for a bird, they are not normal for the upper body of a centaur. Although each tympanum has two animals in a sort of confrontation, they do not

relate to each other, nor are they at all suited to the semi-circular shape.

St. Samson's, Cricklade, Wilts. (85) The Anglo-Saxon church was rebuilt in the early Norman period, to which the carved stones now set over the arcading in the south wall of the nave most probably belong. They seem to have been part of a tympanum, and represent the upper parts of two confronted animals. They have open mouths with pointed jaws, the upper being wider than the lower and having a row of jagged teeth. The foreheads are rounded, and have no ears indicated. Along the upper line of the neck is a grooved mane, more like that of a horse than a lion. The front leg of each bends forward and up, the three toed paws almost touching. The relief is quite deep. The closest parallels are seen at Everton, which represents the confronted heads of animals with manes; but those have large ears and protruding tongues, and seem more like lions than horses. The same indefinite types occurs at Cricklade - the pointed teeth and jaws occur on dragons, while the rounded, earless head could be that of a griffin and the mane is horse like. The confronted paw raised position is characteristic of the group, and another pair shown only by head, neck and forelegs are the goats at Barton Segrave.

St. Margaret's, Knook, Wilts. (86) The church dates from soon after the Conquest, and the architectural traits show evidence of a Saxo-Norman overlap. The tympanum over the south door is frequently described as pre-Conquest, but has sufficient stylistic parallels with other Anglo-Norman carvings to support the architectural post-Conquest date. It represents confronted animals before a central stem whose coiling branches and foliage enmesh them, on the left a dragon, and on the right a lion, both with one front paw raised on to the double central stem, while they bite at the upper coil. The relief is exceptionally shallow, and the figures are barely separated from the background. The treatment is entirely linear, the scrolls covering the surface with a beautifully light and delicate impression. Although the motif of the inhabited scroll, and the rather detailed treatment given to the faces might suggest a pre-Conquest date, with an Anglo-Saxon manuscript source, the style of such manuscripts survived well after the Conquest to serve as a source for other sculptures. There can be little doubt about the Anglo-Norman status of Milborne Port or Wordwell, which repeats the motif of Knook in a much deeper relief, while the theme of confronted animals before the central tree is an essential part of the style. The sensitive treatment of the involved spiral pattern with the animals incorporated does suggest a craftsman well trained in the Anglo-Saxon style, but working in the Anglo-Norman

period, like the group of Scandinavian carvers of Hoveringham, Ipswich and the others. The animals are used to decorate a tympanum in an early Norman church; and while the style suggests Anglo-Saxon influence, the context is undoubtedly Anglo-Norman.

St. Nicholas', Little Langford, Wilts. (87). A church is mentioned in the Domesday Survey; the tympanum and lintel of the south door, which is the only surviving Norman portion after the rebuilding of 1863, is possibly that of the original church. On the tympanum there is an ecclesiastic standing on the left, facing the front, wearing dalmatic, stole and alb and holding a crozier which looks like a branch; to the right is a tree represented by three vertical branches, the central one being the longest, with a bird perched on each, turned to face him. They are shown with large gripping claws, wings with two to three grooved lines to indicate the feathers, and similarly decorated wedge-shaped tails. They closely resemble the birds on the Tapestry, and those carvings which are most like it, the birds at Ely and at Bondleigh. The group of cleric and animals is not uncommon in the Anglo-Norman phase, but this is the only example with a purely bird audience. The motif of three birds in a tree, with the central one being highest also occurs at Stoke-sub-Hamden, where the two outer birds are however perched sideways.

The lintel depicts a boar hunt. On the extreme left are two hounds, facing inwards, and standing side by side so that the body of one crosses behind the other. The heads are long, with the upper jaw extending beyond the lower and the eyes indicated by engraved ovals with central dots; the ears grow side by side and have central triangular excisions. They both wear beaded collars. The near dog is shown with one front leg and two hind, the further dog has one leg to represent each pair, and the paws all have four long toes: the tails have a spiral at the tip. They are leaping forward to snap at the tail of a large boar which fills the middle of the lintel; its tail is forked and knotted, and the bristles along the spine are indicated by a row of grooves. The head is almost as large as the body; its ears and eyes are like those of the hounds, the jaws are longer, and a small tusk juts up from the lower jaw. Crouched beneath its head, and biting at the chin is another hound, and behind it a man leaning forward who wears a sleeved garment with a large collar. In one hand is a weapon, which looks like a cross bow, and the other holds to his lips a curved horn. The scene is excellently adapted to the lintel shape, with the same sort of narrative quality as the extended Tapestry strips; the animals all have vigour and give an impression of movement. And the lintel contrasts well with the rounded shape and upward stress of the tympanum scene. The two seem to be carved by the same hand: the relief is not deep,

but stands out quite sharply from the background, although the raised surfaces are themselves smooth.

The boar hunt on the lintel may be compared with those of Tutbury, where the boar is also being attacked by three hounds, all from the front, and where the huntsman is possibly on horseback; and Clifton Hamden, where there are two hounds, and possibly a third, in front of the boar, and where the standing huntsman holds the curved tail or horn - which is also brandished by the wolf hunting horseman on the Tapestry. As Tutbury dates from 1089, and has the same vigour, in contrast to the deeper relief and more static quality of Clifton Hamden, the Little Langford carving could be as early as this; the manner in which the two hounds on the left are shown is that used by the Tapestry designer in drawing a bunch of horses together, not putting in the total number of legs, as this would give too confused an impression.

On either side of the doorway are attached shafts with carved capitals. That on the left has a group of animals: on the outer face, the profile body of an animal, whose front leg ends in a claw, and hind leg turns into a loop with central beading. Its head is ingeniously placed on the corner of the capital, shown from the front and in deeper relief. On the inner face is a quadruped, with its body placed vertically and head upside down, and above it, another animal head shown facing the front. On the right

hand capital is a mermaid with a double tail, so that the body occupies the corner of the capital, and each tail fills one face; the tails bend upward, with a strand of interlace over them, with the tips being gripped by the upraised hands. The body and upper part of the tail are decorated with diagonal incised lines, and it is in rather deeper relief than the lintel carving. The design is particularly well suited to the shape of the capital, with the orante position characteristic of the mermaid here made functional as well. The two-tailed mermaid is a fairly frequent Romanesque motif; another example of it in the Anglo-Norman group is seen on the font at Anstey, Herts. The sideways position of the animal on the other capital recalls those at Bramber.

All Saints', Netheravon, Wilts. (88) The eleventh century rebuilding of the church seems to be almost contemporary with the Conquest, and the carved capitals of the two half-round attached shafts of each jamb of the door in the west wall of the tower date from this phase. Two felines are represented, one on each side inner capital, with the bodies shown turned towards the door. They both have heads facing the front with the body in profile. That on the right is shown with one front leg, slightly curved under, and two broad hind legs, hanging stiffly down, with the tails bending down between them and coming up to lie within the outline of

the back, ending in a lozenge shaped tip. The one on the right has two short front legs, and one bent hind leg, all ending in three-pointed toes, while the tail bends up over the back and towards the head. The relief is extremely shallow and the surfaces totally flat. The general impression is primitive; the bodies and legs look lifeless, and are joined uncomfortably to the head and neck. There are many points in common with the Durham confronted felines, and also with those of either side of the doorways at Cambridge and Peasmarch, in the position of the tails, while the foliage on the outer faces of the capitals also resembles that at Durham; they confirm stylistically their very early architectural date.

St. Mary's, Elmley Castle, Worcs. (89) The church dates from the late eleventh century, being built soon after the castle in the years after 1086. Carved stones incorporated into the walls of the medieval porch date from the early Norman period, and can perhaps be regarded as fragments of the original tympanum. Two of the stones represent animals, a rabbit and another creature which might be a boar. They both face the right. The rabbit has an engraved almond shaped eye with a central dot, and two long ears, growing side by side with a chiselled central spine. The legs are short, and are walking forward; the body is rounded, and ends in a very short tail which points upward. There is

some trace of lightly engraved diagonal body patterning. The boar has shorter ears, longer legs and a short tail which might be knotted. Its legs are particularly rigid, the separation between the two pairs being only shown by an engraved line. The relief is the same for the two slabs, with a very flat surface, but standing out from the background with a rounded edge, and they could easily be by the same hand, if not part of the same carving. The boar is a common choice, the rabbit unusual, although rabbits do occur in the Tapestry.

Netherton, Worcs. (90) The carved stone now set over the south doorway of the ruined chapel had been found in a nearby stable. It is semicircular in shape, and has obviously been a tympanum. It represents a dragon, reared up and turned to the left. The mouth of the small rounded head is wide open and a wide tongue protrudes, marked with parallel lines; the jaws are outlined by a strip of beading. The body widens immediately below the neck, and on each side there extends a long wing, the upper part marked with rows of small grooves, the lower with long parallel lines. One short leg juts forward, ending in engraved claws. The body narrows again into the tail, which bends sharply up and over the body towards the head, where it ends in two lobes, having a central spine of beading

all the way up. Underneath the body is a row of scalloped moulding, as if to suggest water, and the body itself is decorated with lightly engraved curved lines. The relief is fairly shallow, but the raised outlines are quite sharp; and it seems to stand quite distinct from the background. The earless dragon's head is not unusual, and recalls the bird headed griffins of the Tapestry; while the treatment of the wing feathers is like that of the Ely bird; the carving can perhaps be placed at the very end of the century.

St. Leonard's, Ribbesford, Worcs. (91) The church dates from the early twelfth century, and the carved tympanum and capitals of the north door, and the capitals of the south door belong to this phase. The tympanum represents a man shooting an arrow at a monster, while a small quadruped leaps between them. The man is on the left, a hunched figure, leaning forward, with head too large for the rest of the body, and wearing a long tunic. The head and feet are seen in profile, with the rest of the body facing the front. The long arms end in clumsy fingers which clutch the shaft and string of the bow. Beneath it, and leaping towards him is a small thin animal with pricked ears, longish neck and no tail which might be a deer or a hound. The arrow, which has just left the bow sticks into the throat of a creature with the head of a boar, round body, two thin legs and the wide tail of a bird, obviously some kind of composite,

although unrecognisable monster. The archer seems to be rescuing the leaping animal from it, but this looks rather as if it is a confused version of the hunting scene; and the hound-animal should be attacking the monster as the archer is doing. In other carvings of the group, it is the symbolic dragon or lion that is being shot at by the centaur, and possibly the sculptor also had this sort of theme in mind. The relief is low, and there is background patterning, a survival of the early tradition seen at Durham.

The contemporary capitals on either side of the doorway are also carved. The left outer capital is the most elaborate; it contains a large bird, with raised wing, long hanging down tail and neck bent to peck at the head of the smaller bird which it holds in its claws. Above and below the pair is a fish small in size and seen in simple outline. The preying bird motif is an ancient and significant one, the victim being interchangeably another bird, fish or a small quadruped. Bird on rabbit are seen on the Tapestry, but this seems to be the earliest example of the bird on bird, which reappears in the rather later sculptures of the Hereford school at Aston and Rock. The other capital faces are carved with interlaced bands and dragonesque shapes with central beading.

On the capital on the left of the south door, the south and east faces are each carved with a creature which holds in

its claws a small human figure. There is some confusion of symbols here, for the two creatures are confronted, their heads almost merging at the volute point, so that there should only be one human victim, as in the Gilgamesh-Daniel derived carving at Leckhampstead, but here there are two. And the creature in its position with bent head, long beak and grasping claw recalls the bird on the north door capital - but the victim is a human figure; while the hunched back and general clumsy appearance make it more like the monster of the tympanum. In the low relief and style, the carvings all seem to have been done by the same hand.

St. Andrew's, Stockton-on-Teme, Worcs. (92) The present structure dates from the middle of the twelfth century, but incorporated into it are fragments which must come from an earlier building, and which seem all to have been part of the original tympanum. Over the south door, on a broken slab, is a quadruped seen in profile and facing the right, with the neat head, pricked ear and slender neck of the hound/feline types on the Tapestry. Inside the church, to the right of the chancel arch, facing the left, is an animal of similar type carved on a rectangular stone, while on the left of the arch is the Agnus Dei within a circular medallion. All three stones have the same degree

of relief, standing out from the background, but with extremely flat surfaces. They seem to be of the same date and style; and that they were most probably part of the same carving is suggested by the Anglo-Norman tympana of Bondleigh, with Agnus Dei in a circular frame between confronted birds, the medallions of Alne and Little Bytham, and the rather later Agnus in medallion between felines at Penselwood. (93)

St. Mary's, Alne, North Riding, Yorks. (94) The church dates from the late eleventh or very early twelfth century; the carved lintel of the south chancel doorway has been reset, but most probably dates from this phase. A central medallion contains two entwined dragonesque figures, the medallion frame being clutched on either side by a bird, which clings with beak and claw, while the group is enclosed in a semi-circular frame, which overlaps with the top of the medallion. On each side is a smaller medallion, that on the left containing a feline with tail between the hind legs and up over the back, and the one on the right holding a bird seen in profile with both wings raised behind the back. The whole carving is done in very low and flat relief. It is possible that the bird and feline are meant to stand for two of the Evangelical symbols, although these are most rare in the Anglo-Norman group. The birds with a central medallion are seen at Bondleigh, and may also be compared with those at Little Bytham, which in general treatment and design, the Alne lintel resembles.

St. Peter's, Hilton, North Riding, Yorks. (95) Built into the exterior wall of the church, above and to the right of the early twelfth century south door is a carved slab which seems to date from an earlier period. It is roughly rectangular in shape, but with a rounded upper edge, and might perhaps have been intended to decorate the head of a window, as it looks too narrow for a doorway. On it is carved a lion, with body turned to the right but with backward looking head biting the tip of the tail. The muzzle is squared, the two ears flattened back, and engraved diagonal lines along the neck suggest the mane. The front legs are in a crouched position, the further one raised, while the hind legs are shown sharply bent at the joint ending in most detailed feline paws. The tail comes down between them and up over the back, ending in a pointed leafy shape which goes into the mouth. The relief is very low, and the raised surface quite flat. The backward looking, tail biting position is common for lions and felines in the Anglo-Norman phase, in sculpture and on the Tapestry; the pointed tail tip particularly recalls that at Milborne Port, and the rather accomplished carving has perhaps a two dimensional source. The chancel capitals also seem to be earlier than the south door; they consist of geometric and foliage ornament, but on the one in the south corner of the chancel is another crouched, backward looking, tail biting feline in equally low relief.

St. Mary the Virgin, Leake, North Riding, Yorks. (96) Parts of the early twelfth century church survive, and dating from this period is a carved stone built into the exterior wall to the east of the south porch. It has the same roughly semi-circular form as that at Hilton, and was also perhaps intended for a window head. It represents a lion, with body turned to the right, and head looking backward, with open jaws and protruding tongue. Down the neck are faint engravings suggesting a mane; the legs are very thin, and the further front paw is raised. The tail bends down between the hind legs and up over the back ending in a large, loose knot. Beneath the lion's body is a foliage pattern, but the low relief of the carving has been increased by the considerable weathering it has received, and the details are obscure. The knotted tail is an unusual detail in the otherwise characteristic type, and is possible evidence of the survival of a pre-Conquest, north British sculptural tradition.

St. Oswald's, Newton in Cleveland, North Riding, Yorks. (97) The carved stone found in the churchyard in 1827 has been built into the south tower of the twelfth century church, and its even rectangular shape suggests that it was intended for the lintel of a doorway. It represents confronted dragon and feline; the dragon is to the left, its body parallel to the ground, with an extremely long tail which loops around itself and runs back underneath the length of

the body to end in a snake head with open jaws and protruding forked tongue, like the dragon's own head, which has the addition of a round eye and ear. It has one wing which is raised up over the back and lightly engraved with parallel lines. The feline has also a wide open mouth with a long tongue which hangs below the lower jaw and touches the tip of the dragon's tongue; there are two pricked ears and a small eye. The body is fairly broad, with very short and thin legs, ending in indeterminate feet. The tail comes down between the hind legs and up behind the back ending in a broad leafy tip pointing towards the head. The relief is particularly low, and the surfaces completely smooth. Some kind of symbolic combat is suggested; the open jaws, and extra attacking head on the dragon's tail are more than a mere ornamental confrontation. The broad, rounded lower jaw of all three heads resembles those of Uppington and Everton, related to fantastic rather than real animals, while the shape of the dragon's wing and the large loop of the tail are like those of the dragons at Long Marton, which its posture also resembles.

All Saint's, Old Byland, North Riding, Yorks. (98) The abbey was founded in 1143, but the church incorporates earlier fragments, including two rectangular stones carved with identical dragons, which have been made by the same

hand, and were most probably once part of the same carving, a lintel with the confronted pair. Now they are set on either side of the angles at the ground stage of the tower, each associated with the capital of early type which forms the angle of the wall. The dragons are shown recumbent rather than reared up, the heads backward looking with open jaws, in which double outlining can be seen, and a single pricked ear with inner triangular excision. Both legs are shown, slender and ending in paws, growing in opposite directions from the same point beneath the wing, which is raised straight over the back engraved with parallel lines for the longer wing feathers, and scalloped marking for the shorter ones. The bodies are long and thin, and end in loose knots with a line engraved down the centre of the tail. The relief is quite low, but the edges are gently rounded. While the confronted backward looking dragons are not unusual in the style, and the wing treatment is characteristic, the double outlining, inner line down the tail and knotted tip are all traits suggesting the influence of the pre-Conquest styles in the north which a local craftsman would inevitably have absorbed.

All Saints, Sinnington, North Riding, Yorks. (99) Built in over the south door of the early twelfth century church is a carved stone representing a man seated on an animal;

the weathering of the slab makes it impossible to determine whether horse and rider or Samson/David in combat with the lion is intended. The animal is facing the left, with a horse-like head and neck, but feline tail which bends down between the hind legs and up over the back, ending in a triple curled tip. The hind legs are long and end in hooves rather than paws; the front legs are now completely obscure. The 'rider' is shown facing the front with arms extended, one large hand gripping the neck and the other one of the strands of the tail; he seems securely perched on the back, in that his legs cannot be seen below it. The relief is low, with slightly rounded edges.

St. Bartholomew's, Aldbrough-in-Holderness, East Riding, Yorks.

(100) The church was in existence by 1108, and the carved stone now set over the doorway leading to the south side of the chancel belongs to this period. The roughly semi-circular shape of the design, with the engraved chevron lines around and the narrow arch in the middle suggests that it had been a decorated window head. It represents two confronted quadrupeds with their heads looking backward, slender legs with the front paws slightly lifted, and thin tails which bend up and over the back towards the heads. The muzzles are quite long, with the mouths open, and each has two small ears. Although they are identical types of animal, rather resembling a deer

except for the long tail, that on the left has two further attributes: in its mouth is a long branch, with engraved lines jutting from either side to represent the leaves, while below it and suckling from it is a much smaller animal, with its head raised and hindquarters crouched on the ground. The relief is very low, with the edges faintly rounded. While the confronted, backward looking pair is characteristic of the style, the branch and baby of the one does not contribute to the symmetry; possibly the carving is unfinished, and they had been intended to be the same.

Fridaythorpe, East Riding, Yorks.

In the exterior wall at the west end of the aisle is a carved slab, which must date from the early twelfth century church, of which the south door survives. The carving represents a peacock, seen in profile turned to the right; the body is long, and seems to be leaning forward, with the small head hanging down, and the legs end in two toes each. The tail dominates, being rather larger than the body, enclosed by an oval frame and trailing on the ground. Inside, engraved lines indicate the feathers, and bend to form the 'eye'. The upper part of the slab is broken, and it is not possible to tell what the original shape or function was. The relief is low, with the edges slightly rounded. The peacock is not a common bird in the Anglo-Norman group: a pair of peacocks occur on the Tapestry, there is a single one on the font at Hodnet and a

carved pair on the pre-Conquest Rous Lench cross fragment.

St. Michael's, Emley, West Riding, Yorks. (101) A carved stone has been set into the interior south wall of the south aisle, the upper part of which is broken. It represents animals confronted before a central stem, either tree trunk or cross shaft. On the right is the Agnus Dei, supporting the cross on its inner bent foreleg; the other legs are much shorter and the tail hangs straight down. On the other side is a feline, with the further front paw raised to touch the trunk before it. The tail is not visible, owing to the break in the stone, so it has presumably bent up and over the back. The relief is quite deep, but there is no attempt at modelling the raised surfaces being completely flat. The carving shows a slight confusion of themes, the confronted pair not being identical, and the Agnus Dei having the insignificant role of being only one of a decorative pair instead of being the focal point of the design as it is in other carvings of the period; the carving seems to have been a tympanum.

2. Chronology

Chronology is a vital factor in considering the Anglo-Norman animal style. Without some knowledge of the time sequence, it is impossible to hope to consider the genuine course of development of the style. Of the list of churches with animal carvings of the period, approximately one third, thirty-four, can be dated with varying degrees of accuracy, while the remaining two thirds can merely be regarded as early Norman. It is more easy to date the building than the carving it contains, which has often been moved from its original position and incorporated into a later structure; but a number of examples have remained in situ, and may be considered the same date as the building. Not that the dating of the building is so straightforward; the few documentary sources which actually state that the church was in existence in a particular year do not say when construction started, and can only be taken as *termini ante quem*. The prime example of this is the Domesday Survey, with which must be remembered the additional complicating factors that it did not record all the churches extant in 1086, nor does the mention of a church in the Survey necessarily confirm that its animal carving dates from before that year; it was a period of frequent rebuilding and alterations. The only conclusion that can be drawn from the mention of a church in the Survey is the likelihood of a date before 1086 for a carving which closely resembles one which has

been more firmly dated to before that year.

Apart from documentary evidence, dating can also be made on architectural grounds in examples where the carving is obviously contemporary with the original fabric of the church and, rather less certainly, when a stone which would seem, by comparison, to belong to the earliest phase of the church, has been rebuilt into a later portion of it. There is a certain amount of Saxo-Norman overlap in the beginnings of the Anglo-Norman group, and also churches of the earliest Norman type which compare closely with documentary-dated examples: Durham Castle Chapel is the ideal example, combining both sorts of evidence. Other architectural traits - in particular, the association of a beakheaded arch with tympanum - provide further dating evidence, in this case that the carving is no earlier than c.1130. Architectural dates cannot on the whole be exact to the individual year, but for the Anglo-Norman group, there are a certain number of churches with contemporary carvings which can be placed very early in the series.

Of the dated churches, eleven are referred to in documents, which can be dated themselves and give a year for the existence of the church. These are as follows:

Durham	1072
Bramber	1073
Cricklade	1080
Tutbury Priory	1089
Ely	1093

Stogursey	1100
Much Wenlock	1101
Fritwell	1102
Aldbrough in Holder- ness	1108
Northampton	1108-1116
Southwell	1109-1114

There is also a group of eleven mentioned in the Domesday Survey, and whose carvings can most probably be regarded as prior to 1086: Darley Dale, Ampney St. Mary's, Beckford, Stratton, Whippingham, Sandwich, Ridlington, Wroxeter, Peasmarsh, Alveston and Little Langford.

A further twelve can be placed on architectural grounds: at the very beginning of the group, Cambridge, Barnetby-le-Wold, Selham, Knook and Netheravon, all with evidence of the overlapping of traits after the Conquest, while Alton, Chester, Eggleton, Stottesdon, Milborne Port, Jevington and Long Marton date from the late eleventh rather than the early twelfth century.

From these groups it is possible to draw certain conclusions about the development of the style, which can then be extended to some of the carvings in the undated churches to place them in the sequence. By a further process of stylistic comparison, aspects of undated carvings whose other traits can be cross-dated can be used to refer to further carvings

lacking anything in common with the dated group; but the margin of error becomes much wider.

From the pattern that emerges, a definite internal sequence can be shown which helps to confirm the existence of the Anglo-Norman animal style in its own right rather than as an architectural sculpture which used animal subjects amongst others.

The capitals of Durham Castle Chapel dating from 1072 are the earliest securely known examples of Anglo-Norman carving. They establish the role of animal ornament in an architectural setting - that the treatment is influenced by the shape of the surfaces to be decorated. The animal types show a wide range: confronted felines, a hunting scene, animal masks, mermaid, snake. The treatment suggests that considerable importance is paid to the position of the animals. The felines have the heads turned to the front with body in profile, tails hanging straight down, and only one leg to represent each pair, while the single one has the head looking backward and the tail coming down between the legs and up over the back.

The necks of the deer and horse are shown as straight extensions of the back so that the head hangs stiffly downwards, and all four legs hang with similar rigidity from the body. The use of body and background patterning is characteristic, while a fairly shallow relief is used, detailed features being shown by either a light engraved line or rather deeper incisions.

Similar traits are seen in the group of carvings placed

on architectural grounds at the very beginning of the series. The confronted pairs of felines at Cambridge and Netheravon have the same positions and quality of stiffness about them, and to these may be added those at Peasmarsch, the church extant at least by 1086, which have the same particularly flat relief as at Netheravon, and also traces of engraved body patterning. The faces of the Cambridge ones are very like the Durham examples, with the rounded eye and triangularly incised ear, while at Netheravon only one leg represents a pair. These three carvings each use a pair of felines to frame the doorway but they are free standing rather than placed in a proper architectural frame at this stage. The Durham pair, the only confronted pair in that series, is possibly being influenced by this even earlier tradition which seems to date from the very end of the Saxon period. At Barnetby-le-Wold in a similarly early church, there is a clumsy feline, this time alone, over a small window, with the characteristic traits; and the similar single feline at Stanton-by-Bridge can probably be placed in this horizon. The row of three felines on the lintel at Stottesdon, another church with Saxo-Norman traits are of the same type, with the wideset triangular ears, legs which bend sharply forward to end in long claws as at Durham, Netheravon and Peasmarsch and with some traces of body and background patterning. The fact of there being three animals, not all the same way up, suggests the misunderstanding

by the carver of the function of the confronted pair, but in the smaller details he has successfully imitated his prototypes.

Other undated carvings can be compared to the Durham style. The single animal at Darley Dale and the confronted horned beasts at Beckford have the same rigid neck, head and legs as the stag and horse, and share the same shallow, barely rounded relief and uncertain profile/front facing head. Churches at both these places are mentioned in the Domesday Survey, and these carvings would seem to date from soon after the Conquest. Closely resembling these is the central animal on the reset slab at Shirley in the treatment of body, neck, head and legs, and it has the same faintly horse-like muzzle with long rounded ears. The other animals on this slab have the same stiff neck, and legs lacking any sense of perspective, with no indication of paws or hooves, like the Durham deer. It also seems to represent a hunting scene in which the central animal is pursued by two small dogs which leap up at it with their bodies at right angles to the ground, on either side of its forelegs. The hunched wingless bird at Shirley recalls that perched on the arm of the cross at Beckford.

The animal head of the north door, Beckford, has the double outlined, open mouth, flattened oval eye with central dot and ears with inner triangular line as at the Saxo-Norman

Selham where there is the same relatively uncommon use of the animal head alone, with a certain amount of body patterning and horror vacui impression. The dragon types at Grasmere are of the same family, quite distinct from the dragons seen in combat with St. Michael and those on the Tapestry, and would seem to belong to this early phase.

Bramber, although virtually contemporary with Durham, shows slightly different features; the animal forms are not so happily related to their setting, the capital faces being interrupted by the raised rectangular projections, although the carving itself shows some degree of accomplishment. The felines are shown with tail between the legs and up over the back, and one of them bites at the tip, like the seated Durham feline, while the confronted birds are shown on adjacent faces with the human mask head between them, recalling similar elements at Durham. Although the placing of animals vertically seems to be an early experiment which was soon abandoned, the upside-down dragon on the west face is like a similar creature on one of the capitals of the Alton tower arch group, dating from early in the period, and the choice of felines and birds shown in simple outline and shallow rounded relief is very much in the same style. At Kensworth also there are two pairs of birds and felines in combat, like the two at Bramber, the birds having the same long thin necks and legs, while the wedge shaped tails

and lightly engraved wings are more like those at Alton. The confronted pair in medallions at Little Bytham are of the same type, with slender legs and wings awkwardly raised, and would seem to date from quite soon after the Conquest.

In these very early examples of the style, the carving of the capitals seems of more importance than that of the tympana, which were soon to become the most characteristic area for decoration. The two tympana at Beckford, if they can be accepted as among the first, still use animals as subordinate to the iconography, and the north door is inspired by a manuscript source. But at Milborne Port, which is probably not more than ten years after the Conquest, a confronted pair of lions decorate the tympanum, apparently inspired by a manuscript drawing, but very successfully adapted to a sculptural form; they must be regarded as standing at the beginning of the series of confronted identical animals which form the most typical feature of the Anglo-Norman style. The backward-looking, tail biting position is already familiar from Durham and Bramber, here rather more successfully achieved, and the paws for the first time look authentic. The widely splayed position of the hind legs is also seen on the lion at Ampney St. Mary, which has its head turned to the front with the mane shown along the neck, a feature lacking in the earlier front facing felines. This lion is confronting a griffin, a relatively rare creature in the sculptural group, appearing

sporadically in this particular phase, and not recurring till some time after 1120. Although a confronted, different pair are shown, the lion fills the greater area of the tympanum, as if the sculptor had originally only intended one animal. There is another griffin on the east capital at Milborne Port, in apparent combat with the warrior on the next face, who holds a long kite-shaped shield of the Norman type. At Ridlington, the tympanum shows confronted lion and griffin, the curls of the lion's mane growing from a band across the neck, as at Milborne Port, and the leafy tipped tail extending towards the head, in the manner of the felines at Alton; this carving would seem to come from the church mentioned in the Domesday Survey.

When confronted identical creatures occur, the treatment can still be clumsy and unsure. The tympanum at Stratton shows two feline figures, with heads turned to the front and tails between the hind legs and up over the back in the conventional manner, but far removed from the elegant style of Milborne Port or Ridlington. Between them is the trunk of a tree, another very common feature of the confronted pair, and the background is filled with foliage, a survival perhaps of the ornamented background of the Durham type, but also expressing the influence of the sort of manuscript source behind carvings like Knook and Wordwell, which show animals enmeshed in scrolls of foliage growing from a central stem,

Wordwell appearing rather more developed in style than Knook, which seems to date from early in the period; the tympanum at Lathbury, which perhaps belongs to the very beginning of the twelfth century, is a totally sculptural adaptation of the theme, with the foliage scrolls subordinate to the two solid looking confronted animals with the typically Anglo-Norman attributes of raised paws, protruding tongue and firm stance upon the ground.

Another pre-Domesday confronted pair are the mounted warriors before a central tree at Whippingham, who have the Norman shield type as at Milborne Port; a single horse, but which was possibly originally one of a pair occurs at Kenninghall, shown in a similar advancing position, riderless, but wearing the high ridged saddle of the horse at Durham. The horse is very rare in Anglo-Norman sculpture, and its use can perhaps be ascribed to a single early phase.

The carved animals of Cricklade, which can perhaps be associated with the 1080 building period are unusual in that only the upper part of the animal is shown. There are similar creatures at Everton, neither quite horse nor lion, and represented only by their heads and necks; the difference in the carving between these two, Cricklade being in a fairly deep relief and Everton no more than surface engraving, shows that variety that could exist, although low relief with slightly rounded edges remained the most characteristic. These two

carvings would seem to have been inspired by the same type of 6 with which the two goats at Barton Segrave, again only the upper parts shown with stiffly waving forelegs, might be related. This carving has a place quite early in the series on other analogies; the engraved curls of the mane, and the double outlining of the jaws suggest an early manuscript prototype, with Tapestry parallels, and the separate diapered stones and human mask are features also seen at Stottesdon. A tympanum with more subjects than the confronted pair is also seen at Alveston, where a church was known at Domesday. The west and south tympana are made of several stones, each having a pair of indeterminate animals associated with other decorative motifs of floral and geometric patterns and, on the latter a bird shown standing facing the front with wings extended, a motif occurring also at Acton in slightly deeper relief, but with no other example in the Anglo-Norman group. Whitwell shows a similar confused mixture of animal, floral and geometric ornament, the felines have the typical tail, head and paw positions, but one being upside down.

Confronted different animals were almost as popular as identical ones, although their use suggests a misunderstanding of the basic pattern of symmetrically confronted identical creatures on which the whole style was based. The extremely early tympanum at Egleton shows vertically placed feline and dragon, an unusual combination, framing a central rosette.

At Ault Hucknall and Long Marton are further pairs of different animals, the tympana of Long Marton at the very beginning of the period and the close comparison of Ault Hucknall suggesting that it is not much later. Both give the impression that the sculptor was unfamiliar with his sources and did not understand the subjects that he was carving, which have a more obvious symbolism than the majority of the animals in the style, although similar details relate them to the early group of Anglo-Norman animals. The type of dragon is a development from the graceful more Saxon types of Grasmere and Selham; these are complete with legs and wings and an air of ferocity, and compare with those of Eggleton and Darley Dale. The fins of the mermaid and wings of the dragon and 'centaur' of Long Marton are filled with the lightly engraved parallel lines as on the manes of Cricklade and Everton, and the mermaid has the raised arms of that at Durham, although the tail is unsuccessful and ends in a large knot like those of the dragons. The three-toed claws of dragon and Agnus Dei at Ault Hucknall are like those of the Eggleton dragon, and are fairly common in the style, although the treatment of the feet varies a great deal. Both carvings show the earliest examples of the combat between St. Michael and the dragon; at Ault Hucknall the saint bears the kite shaped shield of the warrior at Milborne Port and a short sword, at Long Marton he is represented only by the wings. With these may be compared the combat carving at St. Bees,

which has more in common with these early examples than the later versions of the motif; only the saint's head is shown, behind the dragon's body, and he also bears a sword. The dragon is in the crouched, backward looking posture of Long Marton, with a similar row of jagged teeth and jaws which curl back slightly at the tip; the tail loops round behind itself ending in a snake's head, a trait also seen at Kensworth, while the associated small bird in a medallion may be compared to those at Little Bytham and Alne. The backward looking, long tongued dragon at Stoke-sub-Hamden may be related to the same horizon; the very flat relief, and the fact that the saint holds sword and spear dissociate it from the later versions of the scene. The mermaid at Stow Longa compares closely to that at Long Marton in the treatment of fins and hands, while the creature beside it is an attempt at the Agnus Dei as unsuccessful as that at Ault Hucknall. The use of three figures in a row rather than two recalls the frieze at Wroxeter, and even Stottesdon; at Ault Hucknall a very small quadruped follows the Agnus figure which confronts the centaur.

The next firmly dated carving is the lintel at Tutbury Priory which is no later than 1089, and confirms the Domesday Survey date for Little Langford, where there is a strikingly similar one. Both scenes represent a boar hunt, the boar being attacked by three hounds, which spring

at its mouth and forelegs and are shown with only one leg to represent each pair. At Tutbury the huntsman appears to have been on horseback, and the rider on the lintel at Kedleston seems to have been part of a hunting scene of this type. The hunter at Little Langford is standing, holding a curved hunting horn; the lintel at Clifton Hamden appears to be later, as the details of the scene have become confused, and the relief is somewhat deeper, but the huntsman figure there is standing clutching the curved horn, or animal's tail, while the boar is again the victim. The influence of these hunting lintels is seen on the tympanum at Ashford, where the conventional pair confronted by a central tree are in fact a boar and a hound, and give an impression of vigour beyond that of the more typical lions or felines. The sharply bent legs of the hound and its long tail with the leafy tip are very like those of the nondescript quadrupeds at Alton, and the carving can probably be placed in the 1080s.

In this previous group of carvings, belonging approximately to the first twenty years after the Conquest, the development of the Anglo-Norman style can be traced from its unsure beginnings to a distinctive architectural form of animal ornament. It is seen at maturity in the capitals of Ely, dating from c.1090, where the animals are in total harmony with their setting, and carved with complete assurance of technique. The choice of lions, felines and birds is typical, and so are the positions: the bird in

profile with extended wing, the lions confronted, paw raised, the feline with tail between the legs and up over the back, the 'fighting' couple with only one leg shown for each pair. The relief is not deep, but the surfaces are very gently modelled, an effect seldom achieved by the sculptors of the period: the flat surface, raised at a uniform level from the background is more common. Ely capitals relate to the animal borders of the Bayeux Tapestry, which belong to this particular aspect of the Anglo-Norman style with the emphasis on symmetry and stylised positions influenced by a two-dimensional source. The adorsed birds at Bondleigh are of this type, with their rounded bodies, grooved wings and tails, and large claws; they are quite different from the birds of Bramber, Kensworth and Alton. The confronted pair with Christ symbol between them had become a popular tympanum motif, the Agnus Dei, Cross or rosette being an interchangeable focal point with the tree or mask head; it is already seen at Egleton, Little Bytham and Alne, and the fragments at Stockton also seem to belong to this phase.

The popularity of the confronted pairs for capital sculpture continues at Stogursey, c.1100, with the typical additions of mask heads and foliage ornament. Felines and dragons are shown, the dragons of the more graceful manuscript type than the realistic opponents of St. Michael. Of similar type, marked by the long knotted tails are the

two pairs of dragons at Old Byland, built into the angles of the arch, and giving the effect of double capitals. The popularity of the dragon motif was such that it was frequently used as a purely ornamental animal, either singly or as a pair, as well as in the symbolic good/evil combats. At Much Wenlock, the lintel most probably in existence by 1101, two dragons are confronted before a central human mask, the tail of one ending in a snake head. The motif is seen at Bramber, where however the head takes the place of the volute, and at Barton Segrave, where it is confronted by lions; and the early date for its use in the Anglo-Norman style can perhaps be extended to Leek-hampstead, where the whole human figure is shown crouched between a pair of dragons. The foliage growing from their bodies compares closely with the ornamental sprigs at Durham, and the extremely flat relief and plain style suggest a place quite early in the series as well as the odd wing treatment as at Eggleton. More elaborate confronted dragons occur at Dinton before a tree, Wynford Eagle and Ipstones, where the tails end in snake heads, and the last two pairs are shown in combat, a further misunderstanding of the confronted motif; these three carvings might date from the early twelfth rather than late eleventh century. The Dinton lintel, showing Saint Michael and the dragon is unusual in that the saint is holding not a weapon but a cross.

The figure of the dragon also occurs in combat rather

than confrontation with another animal; at Newton in Cleveland, with the characteristic looped tail ending in snake head it confronts a feline figure, a carving whose very flat and shallow relief suggests a pre-1100 date. In rather deeper relief, bird and dragon are confronted before a scallop shell on the lintel at Ideford, the bird no longer of the slender Bramber or large-clawed Tapestry type. At Northampton, carved between 1108-1116, the dragon is a grotesque monster with a long tail which in no way resembles the neat pairs of Stogursey or the Tapestry, and the head has lost all the delicate features of the manuscript types, the outlined eye and jaws, and the triangular ears. A few single dragons occur on tympana, all different in style with variously elaborate tails, at Eglo-skerry, which however retains the more detailed head, Uppington and Netherton.

Fritwell, mentioned in 1102, shows another very popular type, a development from the slender confronted felines of the Tapestry; a pair of more sturdy looking creatures with rounded heads are seen confronted before a central tree, whose long tongues, extended upwards, turn into leafy tips. This is the same process seen in the use of the dragon - from the original ornamental pair, the more monstrous aspect has been preferred. Closely similar pairs are seen at Treneglos, where the central tree trunk ends in a scallop as at Ideford, Swarkestone, with a snake behind the tree, recalling the snakes and felines of Stratton; and Llanbadarn Fawr, with the addition of a small

rosette symbol below one of the animals, and the animal mask from which the tree grows. The mask head at Dumbleton with three sprigs growing from the mouth; however the very shallow relief and lozenge-shaped leaves as at Durham and Leckhampstead seem to give it a rather earlier date. The clumsy confronted felines at Covington probably belong to the same early twelfth century horizon.

As with the dragons, the single feline also occurs: those at Leake and Hilton appear in the typical backward-looking, tail biting position. The graceful creature at Santon Downham is shown biting at a leafy branch, while that at Peasmarsh, in a more rounded relief than those on the original chancel arch, is in the crouching posture of Hilton.

The confronted pair at Aldbrough in Holderness, associated with the church which was in existence by 1108, are unusual in that they appear to be hinds, although in the typical backward looking position, with front legs slightly raised; the symmetry is spoilt by the addition of the young animal on the left. The engraved rows of zigzag lines around the figures suggest an attempt to copy a chevron arch, although this shape is not relevant to the narrow window below the carving. The legs of both animals are shown in the sloping position, giving the body the impression of leaning backwards, which is characteristic of the confronted pairs of the very end of the eleventh and beginning of the twelfth centuries.

Different confronted pairs remain common, with the lion or feline as the most recurrent animal. At Salford and Stoke-sub-Hamden, lion and archer-centaur face each other before a central medallion with cross, and tree respectively; in the latter tympanum further symbolism is seen in the three small birds perched in the tree, a motif occurring in slightly different form at Little Langford, and the Agnus Dei hovering over the lion. The Agnus itself is used to confront a feline before a tree at Emley, while at North Cerney, although the feline and centaur are not confronted, being on different walls, they are certainly contemporary and by the same hand; the raised arms of the centaur are in the position of the other human-composite monster, the mermaid, and the feline has its head turned to the front. The engraved outline of these two, and their placing on the outside facing of the church walls is extremely unusual.

Apart from the confronted pairs, certain carvings show an elaboration of iconography. The tympana of Hognaston, Parwich and Stoney Stanton show groups of different animals, and the addition of Agnus Dei and/or cleric suggests a specifically Christian interpretation. There is little evidence for dating them; the first two are in an exceptionally shallow relief, the third in an exceptionally deep one. The two birds at Hognaston are wingless with rounded tails, like those at Wroxeter and Lower Swell - this latter is leaning forward to pluck at a branch, like many in the Tapestry; and

the Wroxeter carving can perhaps be associated with the pre-Domesday church. The feline at Stoney Stanton is an early type, with tail coming between the legs but not extending above the back, and ending in a lozenge shaped tip, as at Netheravon, while the front facing head is attached directly and clumsily to the body without any neck, again like the group of felines at the beginning of the series. However the second feline is more like the Tapestry and Ely type, slender and long necked, in the tail biting position; and its front paw ends in a snake or bird's head, a variation on what is more normally an aspect of the dragon's tail. The dragon there has its tail trailing off into foliage in the manner of the Leckhampstead pair. The antlers of the deer at Parwich, shown as an oval projection with engraved lines around the edge resemble those of the pre-Domesday Sandwich deer rather than those of Durham or the Tapestry, which are shown with individual projections. The unusual almost narrative nature of the subjects distinguish these three from most of the rest of the Anglo-Norman group, but the parallels with the other carved animals would suggest a date before 1100; and these rather primitive animal groups do not recur in later examples of the English Romanesque.

Another narrative scene occurs at Ulgham, and human figures are again associated with the animal ornament. The treatment is extremely crude, the outlines only being marked

by a broadly chiselled line. The forelegs of the horse are bent forward at the knee joint, rather in the manner of the felines at Stottesdon, while the two birds are the early wingless type, and placed together in the upper part of the carving, rather like those at Hognaston. Also the shape of the carving suggests that it was meant to go over a narrow window, a trait which, in other examples seem to be eleventh rather than twelfth century - as at Barnetby-le-Wold. But the animal ornament in this case is so clumsy that it does not form a satisfactory basis for dating.

The tympanum at Southwell, which can be placed in the second decade of the twelfth century, is significant for two reasons: it shows that the Scandinavian style of animal ornament had survived, so that the other examples of this style in Anglo-Norman churches - Hoveringham, Chester, Jevington and Ipswich - are not necessarily re-incorporated pre-Conquest slabs; and it attests the continuing popularity of the saint and dragon combat. St. Michael was the patron saint of the Normans, and a number of the small parish churches have this dedication, with the combat depicted on the tympanum. Early examples of the scene have been suggested for St. Bees, Ault Hucknall and Stoke-sub-Hamden. There are two main types involved: the dragon is shown either fighting or as a prostrate victim, as at Flax Bourton, Hallaton, Kingswinford and Moreton Valence. When fighting, it is shown on the same

level and generally larger than the saint; when defeated it lies or crouches on the ground, and the saint stands over it - in the first two examples actually on top of it. Another division can be made on the basis of weapons, of which the most interesting is the choice of the Anglo-Saxon round or Norman kite-shaped shield. In the early looking carvings of St. Bees and Stoke-sub-Hamden, the saint has no shield but a sword, and sword and spear respectively. At Ault Hucknall however he has a sword and Norman shield; this is also the case at Ipswich, which might therefore date from before 1100 (the weapons can be compared with those of the warrior at Milborne Port). At Dinton, the saint waves a cross at the dragon, while at Flax Bourton the cross is thrust directly downwards into its mouth, the saint holding a short sword in the other hand, the open mouthed motif being derived from the manuscript version of Hell's Mouth being depicted by a dragon's head; at Beckford, the symbolic sword is thrust downwards into it by Christ, and this motif is now applied to the whole dragon. At Kingswinford also the saint pushes his sword down into the dragon's mouth, but the round shield is now the characteristic attribute again derived from manuscript versions of the scene showing a strong survival of Saxon influence. At Moreton Valence and Hallaton, the transfixing weapon is the spear; the saints have become tall graceful figures whose flowing robes make an attractive linear pattern; they are far removed from the dwarfish, early saints. Harnhill seems

an intermediate type; the shield is round but the tunic rather shorter, and the dragon still seems to be having the best of the fight. The most interesting is at Southwell, for although the treatment of the dragon is entirely Scandinavian, the sculptor has been so influenced by the well-established Anglo-Norman model of the early twelfth century that the saint has the Saxon style round shield.

The dragons vary in type, becoming increasingly less ferocious and more ornamental, as the religious aspect of the scene - and consequent victory of the saint - takes over from the more exciting combat with a monster. A recurrent element is the use of a line of beading down the spine of the back and tail, a detail of ornament surviving from pre-Conquest times and a particular attribute of the dragon; it is seen on those of Leckhampstead and Much Wenlock, and in the St. Michael group at Kingswinford and Flax Bourton. It also occurs on ornamental interlace associated with animals at Lathbury, Little Langford, Stow Longa and Ribbesford, showing a further degree of manuscript influence.

Apart from the saint and dragon motif, other scenes of combat become popular in the Anglo-Norman group, as a development of the two purely ornamental confronted creatures. At Kencott, the archer-centaur, inscribed Sagittarius, fires an arrow into the mouth of the large head representing the dragon's body - a development of the Hell mouth theme of

Beckford, with the additional confusion of the zodiac sign; the same is seen at Stoke-sub-Hamden, where the centaur and lion are more than merely confronted. The centaur is definitely firing at the lion, and they are again labelled with their zodiac signs. This use of inscriptions would seem to be a later rationalisation of the role of already popular animal motifs, and suggests the influence of manuscripts, and the increasing popularity of calendar and constellation motifs as a source for sculpture, an aspect of the mature Romanesque style. At Ribbesford a long-skirted human figure fires an arrow at a hump-backed monster, while a hound leaps between them; the figures are crude and clumsy, but it does not look particularly early; it has the same grotesque look as the exaggerated confronted pairs of Fritwell and Swarkestone and it is possible that the whole carving is an attempt at a hunting scene of the Little Langford type; the treatment of the animal's tail, although enlarged is rather like that of the boar at Ashford, the hound is leaping in the wrong direction, and the human with bow and arrow is a combination between huntsman and archer-centaur of this time. The relief shows a rounded rather than flat surface. The left capital shows a large bird swooping on a smaller one, the first example in sculpture of this very ancient motif; while the fish above and below suggest the similar bird on fish motif. On the left capital of the south door is a variation, again rather confused, of the Gilgamesh-Daniel subject, but

the human victim has been duplicated in the cause of symmetry, and the attacking figures are bird-like monsters. These unrecognisable creatures at Ribbesford are rather like the two confronted large-headed animals at Little Paxton, shown in another elaborate and cryptic scene, before a cross, with a human figure and the Agnus Dei. At Newton Purcell, a snake is shown biting at the tail of a bird in the middle of a tympanum filled with elaborate foliage and geometric ornament; neither can really be compared to any other Anglo-Norman birds or snakes, and they are overshadowed by the rest of the decoration, suggesting a late and uneasy survival of the animal style. At Great Salkeld, another bird is shown, this time swooping on to the back of a small quadruped, and also holding the headed tail in its claws. On the associated capitals are interlacing snakes, a feline mask, and a wingless, legless dragon with a spirally curling tail. The elaborate triple capital and the chevron arch suggest an early twelfth century date; the animal find few points of comparison with others of the style, the carving showing an accomplished hand but completely lacking in symmetry or an obvious Christian interpretation.

The carvings of the early twelfth century show an increasing association with the human figure: at Southwell beside the saint and dragon is shown David and the lion, a motif which was to become increasingly popular as the pure animal style was left behind; this subject is also seen at Sinnington, a

carving which might be much later than its primitive style suggests. Its use by the Scandinavian trained carver of Southwell implies that it was already a well known subject. The earlier simply confronted pairs become superseded by animals which are no longer instantly recognisable, with many elaborations of detail; the maturity of technique is seen in a gradual deepening and rounding of relief, although this cannot be taken on its own as a guide to chronology. In the years after 1120, sporadic examples of animal carving in the Anglo-Norman style do occur, but they can no longer be considered characteristic of or contributory to the development of that style, which had elsewhere been replaced by the full English Romanesque, with a much greater stress on narrative and iconographic sculpture, in which pure animal ornament played a smaller role. The main sources became manuscripts, with increasing use of the Bestiary, and the original eastern element, which had been progressively westernised during the eleventh century is barely recognisable. In the earlier Anglo-Norman style, the use of animal ornament in sculpture seems almost instinctive, and employs rich sources of a non-Christian tradition, although used in a religious setting. But after the first quarter of the twelfth century this is no longer valid, and comparisons with the Bayeux Tapestry can no longer be made.

3. The Anglo-Norman animal style

Apart from this tentative chronology, there are many aspects of the Anglo-Norman animal style which do not depend on dates. Out of the approximate number of 100 examples of carving, 50 consist of ornamentally confronted pairs, of which 36 pairs are identical. The felines are most popular, with 13 identical pairs, 8 single figures and 5 shown confronting different animals. There are 4 pairs of confronted lions, and 5 confront different animals. For the dragons, there are 9 examples of the confronted pair, 4 confront different animals, 4 appear singly, 12 appear in combat with the saint and 2 are represented by the head alone, at Beckford and Kencott. There are 6 pairs of birds, and 6 single examples, but they occur more frequently in a narrative or symbolic rather than ornamental context. This is the greatest point of difference with the Tapestry, where the symmetrically confronted pairs of birds outnumber even the felines; as in the sculpture group, the lions are rather less frequent. The other main difference is the lack of griffins in sculpture, for these form quite a good proportion of the Tapestry ornament. But in the carved group there are no examples of confronted griffins; only 2 occur confronting other animals, at Ampney St. Mary and Ridlington, while at Milborne Port one is in combat with a figure like St. Michael.

The confronted pairs do not necessarily appear alone but frequently have a focal point between them; the tree is most common with 14 examples, there are 5 examples of the mask head or human figure, and 6 of the medallion containing Agnus Dei, cross or rosette.

In contrast to the ornamental symmetry, a certain number of carvings take as their subject a group of various animals, which can be given a Christian meaning by the addition of the Agnus Dei or a clerical figure. There are 9 of these, characterised by the lack of symmetry and the variety of animals shown, and these can be compared to one or two scenes of this type on the Tapestry. Hunting scenes also occur, with 6 examples of the type, the boar being the most favoured victim, and it also appears on the other animal groups, at Hognaston and Parwich, and on its own at Ipswich and Elmley Castle. At Ashford it is shown confronting a hound before a central tree, but does not appear as an identical confronted pair.

The same is true of the centaur and mermaid, whose symbolic natures seem to prevent them from being used as purely decorative confronted pairs (in contrast to the dragon, which is used as a narrative, symbolic and ornamental figure). The centaur is used to confront a lion or feline, at Salford and Stoke-sub-Hamden where however the Sagittarius aspect is stressed, while at Kencott it is firing the arrow into the

dragon's mouth. In the other 3 examples, Long Marton, Ault Hucknall and North Cerney, it is associated with although not ornamentally confronting other creatures. The mermaid appears alone at Durham and Little Langford, and associated with other creatures at Long Marton and Stow Longa.

Another creature with sporadic, faintly symbolic appearances is the snake. Possible Temptation references occur when it is associated with the central Tree, as at Swarkestone and Stratton; it is seen with birds at Newton Purcell and Wroexeter, and being trampled by a deer at Parwich.

There are various details of treatment and position which continue throughout the style not associated with any particular animal. Animals may occasionally be placed upside down or at a sideways angle to the line the rest are standing on; they are shown upside down at Whitwell, Alton, Stottesdon and Bramber; and sideways at Bramber and Little Langford. They can be represented by the upper part of the body alone, singly or confronted; at Beckford and Kencott, single heads are used, at Everton confronted heads, and at Cricklade and Barton Segrave confronted heads and forelegs are shown.

The extended tongue is a recurrent feature, sometimes touching that of the other confronted animal, as at Everton, Leckhampstead, Alveston and Milborne Port, while excessively long tongues are seen at Fritwell and Moreton Valence. Alternatively the upper front paws may be raised and touching,

sometimes giving the effect of combat, as at Alveston, Ipstones, Wynford Eagle, Ridlington and Ely. The raised front paw is a common attribute of the confronted pairs. There is a limited amount of surface decoration of the animals themselves: at Durham and Peasmarsch this consists of purely ornamental lightly engraved lines, but other examples show an exaggerated treatment of the animal's natural appearance - at Stoke-sub-Hamden the lion's mane is extended to cover the neck; the dragons of Hoveringham, Southwell and St. Bees are covered with scallop patterns to represent the scales, while others have the line of beaded moulding down the body and tail; the bird at Acton has rows of grooves to represent the feathers, and the Little Langford mermaid has scaly tail and body. Another occasional detail is the use of a double outline, especially around the features of the animal's face, to give a linear two-dimensional effect; the mouth, eye and ears are the most frequently outlined.

The architectural setting has some effect on the choice and treatment of the animal subjects; the sculptures considered are found on four main areas, capitals, lintels, tympana and window heads, apart from those loose or reset stones whose fragmentary condition make it impossible to determine their original shape or position. 51 of the examples decorate tympana, of which 31 are confronted pairs and 23 of these identical; out of the 16 lintels only 2 show confronted pairs,

the bird and dragon at Ideford, and the not entirely identical felines at Stottesdon. The semi-circular shape of the tympanum was obviously preferred for the confronted pair, although of the 5 window heads only one, Aldbrough, is carved with an identical pair; otherwise the narrowness is not suitable for such a horizontal design. The lintels however are ideal for the extended scene of the hunt, which does not occur at all on the tympanum; and the 4 lintel examples of the saint and dragon combat show the opponents side by side, with the dragons somewhat longer and squatter than those on the tympana.

The shape of the capitals also lends itself to the confronted pair, either on the same face or on two adjacent faces with heads touching at the corner: of the 13 churches with carved capitals, 9 of them have confronted pairs among the decoration. A whole series of carved capitals occur at Durham, Ely, Alton and Stogursey which gives scope for a variety of motifs; these four, all dating from before 1100 use animal motifs almost exclusively (with the exception of the human mask heads, supporters and huntsman at Durham) interspersed with foliate designs, in contrast to the historiated capitals of the twelfth century.

Of the loose and reset stones, their shape and slab-like appearance suggests that they are generally fragments of such tympana and lintels which have been discovered and reincorporated during the many stages of building and

restoration which are characteristic of the English parish church. Fonts have not been included in this survey; they have already been studied in greater detail than Anglo-Norman architectural sculpture, and are not, on the whole, so concerned with pure animal ornament. Also they can only be dated on the basis of stylistic comparison, without even the tenuous architectural and documentary evidence that may apply to some of the churches, and could only be used to elaborate, not to establish a scheme of chronology.

The distribution of the style is not of great significance, and does not relate to chronology, the earliest carvings occurring as far apart as Sussex and Durham, with no particular pattern emerging from their spread. This can be attributed to the rapidity of the Norman Conquest, and the consequent increase of church building which brought the new style to all parts of England in a relatively short period.

SECTION II

PRE-CONQUEST ANIMAL SCULPTURE IN BRITAIN

The use of the animal form is an integral part of Anglo-Norman stone sculpture. It is not so characteristic of Anglo-Saxon carving, nor is it recurrent in Norman architectural sculpture until the beginning of the twelfth century, after Anglo-Norman influence has been felt. And while the choice and treatment of many of the Anglo-Norman animals can be seen to have been inspired by two-dimensional manuscript and textile art, to be considered in Sections III and IV, the general use of animals carved in low relief and a few particular motifs find their closest parallels in north and west Britain in the period of Viking influence, where animal ornament formed a predominant part of stone sculpture and where certain themes which reappear in the Anglo-Norman group may have originated. While this is not necessarily a case of direct influence, there does seem to be an underlying current, a compound of local elements blended with the new style, resulting in the examples of survival that there are. The groups of pre-Conquest sculpture - Irish, Scottish, Manx and North English - have more in common with each other than with the Anglo-Norman animal style, but they each share certain aspects with it. At the same time, there are marked differences between the groups, arising out of the various factors contributing to them, as to the Anglo-Norman style.

The catalyst is the Scandinavian invasion: the common element animal ornament, which is a more characteristic part of Viking art than of any of the other styles involved.

A. Ireland

The use of animal ornament in Irish stone sculpture is of great diversity owing to a long development and a wide number of sources. It is not possible to speak of an Irish animal sculpture style as such, as the ornament involves material from at least six types of animal style. There are a number of motifs held in common with the Anglo-Norman group, not of overwhelming significance, but of some interest, as there is an obvious Irish chronological priority; and the contacts with the English church, particularly strong from the end of the eleventh century, which helped to contribute to the development of the Irish Romanesque style from c. 1130, may also have resulted in influence in the opposite direction and the inclusion of Irish elements in the Anglo-Norman style. (1)

From the eighth to the twelfth centuries, the high crosses had their own sequence of development, as significant a part of Celtic Christian art and iconography as the manuscripts of the period; their ornament played the same role as that of the architectural sculpture of the Romanesque period, with the same blend of ornamental, symbolic and narrative subjects,

animal motifs occurring in all three categories.

The most significant parallel with the Anglo-Norman style is the scene of a group of animals of different type placed rather haphazardly in one or two rows, and sometimes associated with a human figure. This group, seen in the Anglo-Norman style at Hognaston, Parwich and Stoney Stanton, does not lend itself well to the semicircular shape of a tympanum, but is ideally suited to the rectangular panels at the base of the high crosses, where such groups are characteristic.

(Figs. 4, 5a; pl. 39) The same unrecognisable quadrupeds with short necks and long tails as well as the recurrent boar, deer and birds are common to both. The association of such a variety of animals has little apparent meaning on the Anglo-Norman carvings, but some sort of symbolism is given by adding the Agnus Dei and a distinctly clerical figure with crosier, book or bell, in contrast to the Irish figures, who carry staffs and look more like shepherds or huntsmen. These mixed groups perhaps represent some scene of religious significance such as Noah or Orpheus as forerunner of Christ, inspired by an ivory carving of continental, possibly Carolingian origin, as has been claimed for several of the shaft panel scenes. (2) Or it could be that such a scene, which is basically naturalistic and disassociated by its position on the base of the cross from the iconographic panels of the

shaft and arms is influenced by the similar hunting panels, showing a survival of Celtic mythology. (3)

The hunting motifs, which are characterised by the placing of a hound over or behind the deer, and associated with a horse and rider are the influence behind the Manx hunting groups, and possibly the Scottish ones; and they can be regarded as one of the sources of the Anglo-Norman representations. On a number of crosses, hounds are shown leaping up at right angles from the ground at the deer in the manner of those at Durham and Shirley, and frequently appear with only one leg to represent each pair, bent forward at the joint in a crouching position. The boar appears occasionally, although not in exclusively hunting contexts: it is the deer which is the main victim. The Kedleston horse and rider perhaps reflect the Irish mounted huntsman, the motif being otherwise very rare in the Anglo-Norman group, while the Durham hunter leads his horse. The bird also appears as a part of the deer hunt in the base panel carvings, although it is a large figure and stands behind the deer rather than on its back, as at Shirley and in the Manx carvings.

Birds standing on the back of other creatures occur, as at Kells Market Cross, pl.39, in a more predatory aspect, which is that also seen at Kensworth and Great Salkeld, where large birds perch on the back of small quadrupeds, and peck at them. (At Kensworth also, the two pairs of

backward turned, confronted birds shown in simple outline on the arch of the west door associated with interlace-carved stones find far closer parallels in Ireland than in the Anglo-Norman style, as on the cross at Inishkeel (4).) The bird on fish motif, seen at Kells, and in the Anglo-Norman group at Ribbesford is of such wide distribution that this cannot be regarded as an example of direct influence.

An interesting parallel occurs at Clifton Hamden, where the carving, which has presumably been a lintel, shows a frieze of three animals and a huntsman; the central animal is biting the ear of the one facing it. This same motif is seen on the east base panel of the Monasterboice South Cross (5) with animals of similar appearance and proportions, where again it is the taller animal on the right biting the ear of the shorter one on the left. The rectangular frame of the scene and the quite deep relief give Clifton Hamden a style that would not look at all out of place on the base of an Irish cross and suggests that its carver was aware of such a Celtic prototype. Also on the carving is a small mask head placed under the body of the left side animal which recalls a similar oddly placed mask on the right arm of the Moone Abbey holed Cross (6); this cross also shows exotic human headed quadrupeds, a type seen at Little Paxton, and otherwise not used in the Anglo-Norman group, and on this tympanum associated with a clerical figure and other animals as if influenced by another Irish

type. In other respects, Clifton Hamden is a hunting scene, and belongs to the small group of lintel carvings of this type, which have other points in common with the pre-Conquest carving style.

There is another animal style seen on the Irish High Crosses which is quite different from that of the base panels of fairly naturalistic animals; this resembles the Anglo-Norman one in that use is made of identical confronted pairs. These are on the whole rare and have the appearance of being an intrusive late element. On the Durrow Abbey High Cross, which is dated to the early eleventh century (7), two winged quadrupeds are confronted before a tree with extended branches at the top; the front paw of each is raised to touch the trunk, and the tails curl down between the hind legs and up over the back. An almost identical creature is seen on the Duleek north Cross (8), recalling the sporadic use on the Tapestry of a single animal which is more normally seen as one of a pair. At Tihilly (fig. 5 g.) a pair of confronted birds have their necks entwined, like a pair on the Tapestry, but with the addition of a mask head between them; at Bramber, birds confront a mask head. Those confronted, symmetrical motifs seem to belong to a late stage of the High Cross series and occur not as a result of Anglo-Norman influence, but as a result of the same factors which inspired it and much of the animal element in Romanesque art: the

use of the symmetrical pair in a range of types and with details of treatment which can be traced to textile ornament of eastern origin.

Another form of animal ornament on the crosses is one which has most in common with Scottish carving - the use of a wide range of creatures of fantastic and recognisable type, and their placing in horizontal or vertical rows, (pl. 40), as well as a more straightforward copying of the horse and rider processions. (pl. 41). The centaur occurs among the Irish rows carrying a bow and arrow or branch; while it is a recurrent figure in Romanesque art, it is interesting that the centaurs in the Tapestry do not carry anything in their hands, while the carved Anglo-Norman examples have a weapon, as if stemming from a different tradition; that at Ault Hucknall however carries a branch.

There are a certain number of Viking types in the Irish carved animals: the Ahenny South and Tybroughney crosses (9) show animals in the Manx style, with misunderstood joint spirals, especially the Tybroughney human-headed quadruped which has no fewer than six on its body; on the same stone is a centaur holding two axes, the only example in Ireland of this Scottish type. The stone seems to be the work of Vikings using the same Scottish themes as the Manx group; the deer however lacks the distinctive high stepping front leg, although the long slender antler is faithfully copied. The Ahenny carving shows a horse and rider and four other

animals in a confusion of horizontal and vertical placing, all with the distinctive joint spirals.

Despite the historical context of Viking raids and settlement, the most obviously Scandinavian carvings do not occur until the eleventh and twelfth centuries; interlaced animals are seen on a number of late crosses, such as Tuam (pl. 43) with similar ornament appearing in manuscripts and metalwork, not deriving from the interlace of the earlier crosses, of Celtic-Germanic type, but having more in common with the Urnes style. In Irish Romanesque sculpture there is a strong survival of this form of ornament, which appears side by side with the more conventional forms derived from England and the Continent. (see pl. 44) The existence of these styles side by side may be compared with the sporadic appearance in the Anglo-Norman period of Scandinavian types, which is another reason that they should not automatically be regarded as pre-Conquest; in Ireland, this duality survived up to the end of the twelfth century.

It is not easy to make any definitive statement on the chronology of the Irish crosses, beyond stating that they were generally earlier than the carvings of the Anglo-Norman style. The earliest forms of carved ornament, of the Cardonagh and Fahan Mura type can be compared to manuscript illustration of the late seventh century, combining motifs of much earlier Celtic art with a considerable eastern influence, which

remains a constant source for the development of early Christian art in Ireland; and not only in manuscripts, but in the use of the carved cross itself, with possible prototypes in sculptured Coptic slabs and hypothetical Armenian carved crosses, as a result of oriental sculptors coming to Ireland through the pressure of the Moslems and the growth of iconoclasm. (10) There were also a variety of models for ornamental motifs, reaching Ireland from the continent and east Mediterranean world as a part of the far flung net of Christianity: "des icones venues d'Italie ou d'Orient des manuscrits de toutes origines, byzantins, coptes, italiens, carolingiens cette multiplicité d'inspirations contradictoires, ces incoherences qui viennent de docilités a des modèles heteroclités." (11) These ecclesiastical trimmings brought with them the influence of the animal art of the east, whose confronted, heraldic pairs remained a characteristic type of ornament.

These very close contacts with the rest of Europe and the mediterranean world were in some ways affected by the Viking raids, which had such a disastrous effect upon the treasures of the churches; as the Vikings gradually became converted, Scandinavian animal ornament, itself partly inspired by the Germanic interlace of the looted shrines and reliquaries from Ireland, was adopted into a Christian art. The Viking

settlement of Scotland also affected Irish art; a range of types and scenes which seem a development from Pictish art, appearing abruptly (in contrast with the previous non-representative Irish animal art), in the Irish sequence. The elaborate High Crosses with the base panels can be loosely dated from the late ninth to the eleventh centuries; some of the carvings might be the work of Vikings converted and trained in the Irish manner, and from the eleventh century more obviously Scandinavian animal ornament can be recognised, which survives into the Romanesque architectural sculpture of the twelfth century.

The popularity of animal ornament, the recurrent forms which do not have an immediate and obvious symbolism do not spring from an entirely Christian background, but their use in so Christian an art as that of the early Irish church was one of the sanctions by which the sculpture style could survive into the Anglo-Norman period. The mixed animal groups cannot be regarded as typical of the Anglo-Norman style, but they are typical of the Irish base panels, incorporating a mixture of Scottish motifs and Celtic mythology; and the rectangular shape of the panels is still reflected in the uneasy tympana designs of Hognaston, Parwich and Stoney Stanton, which can be attributed to the influence of the Irish crosses.

B. Scotland

Animal motifs are the most frequent form of ornament in Scottish stone carving from the fifth century onwards. In contrast to Ireland, there is one distinctive style of animal art, that of the Picts, which, after their conversion from Ireland in the late sixth century, was adopted into the Christian art of the cross slabs; and although the function of the distinctive animal symbols was gradually lost, the style remained in the popularity of certain animals, and in many details of treatment. The already established use of animal ornament on what seem to be memorial stones resulted in a much greater popularity of animal motifs than in Ireland; and in fact a reflux movement can be seen, the Irish high crosses of the ninth and tenth centuries having many animal motifs of Scottish origin. This can partly be attributed to the pressure of the Vikings in the north, and their raids on the religious sites, which led to a considerable displacement of population; and the adoption by the Vikings of the Scottish style can be seen in Man and a few examples in Ireland. The contacts with Ireland and also with Northumbria from the eighth century, which are seen in the borrowing of the cross types, would have led to a new range of models available from the wide artistic sources of east Mediterranean Christianity and the more local developments from them.

There are a few motifs in common between Scottish and

Anglo-Norman art which might result from the surviving influence of the former style, although the common origin of both should also be considered. The motif of a deer-like animal suckling its young, which appears as one of a confronted pair at Aldbrough in Holderness, is seen at the ninth century St. Vigean's 1 (12) a stone with an exotic selection of haphazardly placed animals, including a dromedary and the bird-on-fish motif. There is a curious resemblance between the animal at Stratton, one of a confronted pair, which has its head turned to the front and is apparently wearing a crown, and a similar creature, one of a vertical frieze, at Rothesay 2. (13) This stone, having no Pictish symbols, belongs to the third class of the Scottish monuments; the associated griffin and human headed beast show the wide sources available. The use of animals or birds confronting mask heads, not infrequent in the Anglo-Norman style appears in the later Scottish stones; at Newton Woods 2 and Inchinnan (figs. 5e, 5f) the head is being gripped by the open mouths of the animals, and in the former case, the use of the human head alone rather than the whole body, with the Daniel-Gilgamesh aspect, might be a survival of the Celtic head-eating monster tradition. These stones both belong to the third class, and are associated with motifs also appearing in English Romanesque sculpture: an animal with a human leg in its mouth, animals with head facing front and body in profile, the tail bending down between the legs and up over

the back, a winged horse. A further mixture of styles is suggested by the Manx type of hooked spiral wrongly placed, on the animal on the lower left side of the Inchinnan monument, and the Scandinavian form of the entwined front legs of the Newton Woods pair. (cf. fig. 8a) This perhaps could mean a Scandinavian carver, working in the conventional style of animal friezes; the Manx spiral suggests a late tenth or early eleventh century date, and this is not contradicted by the other models used.

Another Scottish Anglo-Norman parallel, with some degree of Scandinavian influence is seen in the strands of interlace entwining the tails of the mermaid at Little Langford; while the two-tailed mermaid is characteristic of Romanesque sculpture, the added strands are not, but can be seen decorating similar upright two-tailed creatures at Kildalton and Meigle 22 (figs. 5h, 5i). The motif of a figure with arms and legs entwined in interlace is a Scandinavian one; it could refer to Gunnar in the snake pit, the bound devil theme, or even the figure of Christ (as on the Jellinge stone) but the fish tail attribute of Little Langford which gives the figure the mermaid aspect of the Bestiary is first seen on the Meigle carving.

The tail which ends in the head of another animal is most characteristic of Anglo-Norman dragons, but at Kensworth and Great Salkeld, the tails of small quadrupeds end in animal

heads; at Gask (fig. 5j) a stone of Class 11, there is a similar quadruped in a vertical frieze, whose other animals include the human headed quadrupeds with long hair seen on the Moone Abbey Holed cross, with the distinctively Pictish lobate scroll joints. This is the only Scottish example of the headed tail motif, and it is not known in Ireland, Man or Scandinavia; it does however appear in continental Romanesque sculpture (14) and the source of it must lie in a common factor, something which might also have reached Scotland in an earlier period as a portable object - an ivory or textile decorated with a range of fantastic animals. The centaur with bow, branch or axes which appears on a number of the Scottish stones (e.g. figs. 5b, 5c) is more common than on the Irish crosses; while the Sagittarius figure of Anglo-Norman art is inspired by Zodiac illustrations, the centaur with branch of Ault Hucknall probably derives from the northern tradition.

As with the Irish and Manx crosses, the hunting scene is one of the most characteristic elements: hounds are placed behind, in front of or above the deer, shown sometimes upside down or springing vertically at it, a position related to those at Durham and Shirley, which in no way resemble the hunting scenes on the Tapestry. Elements of this theme are sometimes incorporated into large groups of animals and human figures; the boar does not appear as a victim. A small bird is sometimes associated with the deer (fig. 5h) and the carving at

Sandwich perhaps reflects this tradition, isolated bird and deer not otherwise appearing in the Anglo-Norman style.

While in Ireland the hunting groups seem intended as a part of the Christian iconography of the crosses, in Scotland the deer, and also horse and hound, belong to the range of Pictish symbols; and their recurrence in the hunting groups of the Class II and III stones must partly stem from the influence of this earlier use. Elements of the style survive in certain details of treatment: the high stepping front leg of the deer or horse, a feature of the Class I stones, remain constant and reaches Man and Ireland, surviving into the later carvings there. The single horse at Kenninghall has this posture, perhaps the latest example of this ultimately Scottish type.

As well as these specific motifs, a number of traits which are characteristic of the Anglo-Norman style occur in Scottish animal carving - backward-looking tail-biting felines, protruding tongues, the tail curled down between the legs and up over the back, body in profile and head facing the front, confronted pairs; these traits can be generally associated with the later stones, those no longer carved with the Pictish symbols. This is not a case of direct influence: for one thing, these aspects are more typical of the Anglo-Norman style than of the earlier Scottish carvings; and must therefore arise out of influence

in common between the two. To study these influences, it is necessary to consider the chronology and arrangement of the Scottish stones which, unlike the Irish carvings do not have so great a body of comparative material in metalwork and manuscript. The division of the Scottish stone monuments into three classes (15) is a typological rather than stylistic one; figural ornament of identical style can occur on the carvings of Class II and III, the division being made by the absence of the Pictish symbols. It has been shown that the animal style of the symbols progresses from its 'assumed origin in the sixth to fifth centuries B.C. in Europe or further eastwards, through Switzerland, southern Germany and France to eastern England, and thence to lowland Scotland and Pictland'.

(16) The ultimate origin of this animal style is Eurasiatic and the tentatively suggested medium of transmission is tattooing. The non animal symbols of the Class I stones provide evidence of a similar stylization of Iron Age subjects.

This distinctive style, which is that of the Class I monuments, roughly dressed stones with the ornament incised, also distinguishes the stones of Class II, which have a cross on one side, and the symbols generally on the other in association with a range of other motifs, while a gradual refinement of technique and development of relief is seen; the Class III stones lack the symbols entirely, although some of the animals retain aspects of the Pictish style - the use of the

lobate scroll rather than spiral to indicate the joints of certain animals, the posture of deer and horse discussed above, and the popularity of deer, hound and bird which continue as subjects of the hunting scenes which formed a part of Celtic and Christian iconography.

In the stones of Class II the range of new animal motifs reflects the new contacts resulting from the conversion of the Picts, and in particular the relationship with the Ireland in the use of carved crosses interpreted in Scotland, with the exception of the Iona group, as cross slabs. The animal ornament falls into two main types, naturalistic and purely decorative. The first category are basically recognisable animals, treated in a realistic manner in engraving or shallow relief: hunting scenes, monsters, combat groups, fantastic creatures, placed on the surface of the stones sometimes in completely haphazard manner, but also to fill the spaces at the side and base of the crosses, in vertical and horizontal rows, although the individual motifs were essentially unrelated. The second type seems to be inspired by Irish manuscript ornament in the use of interlacing patterns descended from the animal ornament of the Germanic Style II, and developed in Irish art from the seventh century. Features include the round eye with triangular section at the end, long necked creatures with double outlines and confronted figures at the

top of the stone (or page). This sort of style is also seen on the Irish crosses; however, its two-dimensional nature suggests that a manuscript might have been the direct source. The influence of east Mediterranean Christianity and art must be recognised in Scottish as well as Irish sculpture, both directly and through the interpretation of such styles in Irish and Northumbrian art. (17)

The Class III stones show the continuity of these elements, but are marked by a wider area of distribution, especially in southern Scotland, and a new animal style in the use of clumsily realistic animals, which closely recall those of early Anglo-Norman type, as at Shirley, Beckford and Darley Dale in the rigidity of neck and body, dangling stiff legs and straight hanging tails. Related to these are animals in the latest phase of the Welsh sculptural sequence, remarkable for its 'sterility and ineptitude'; it is derived from mixed Irish and Northumbrian tradition, with a certain amount of Scandinavian influence in the animal style (attempting to depict the horse and rider, deer and hounds of the Manx stones, while others show animals of vaguely Jellinge type.) (18) It is possible that some of these late Scottish stones are also Viking work, although lacking the Urnes interlacing seen on the later Irish carvings.

A curiously parallel course of development can be traced

between the Scottish stones and the picture stones of Gotland which show some of the factors arising from the common Iron Age background; the resemblance between them cannot be satisfactorily ascribed to direct influence. The Gotland stones have been divided into three main phases. (19) The first dates from the fifth century; the stones, rectangular slabs, are engraved with geometrical patterns, some showing a close relationship to Celtic art, and representative motifs - ships, horse and riders and animals, which do not form any recognisable scenes. Some of these may be compared to motifs on the Gallehus horns (20) which date from c.400 and show a wide range of haphazardly placed subjects; the sources of the various elements can be traced from Bronze Age rock carvings, Celtic iconography, Gothic-Sarmatian aspects and elements of eastern Mediterranean art. The style is related to that of Sossdala, the Scandinavian fifth century style which preceded the development of Germanic animal ornament resulting from the combination of late provincial Roman and Gothic elements; it is seen on the metalwork of the period and is characterised by the combination of engraved ornament with more moulded figures, the technique of Gallehus, with which motifs are shared - the horned horse, spiral snakes, Thor's hammer, a range of small animals, stars, triangles and plant motifs all occur on the bracteates also.

While the Pictish symbols show the archaic survival of one aspect of Iron Age culture, the many points in common between the Gallehus-Gotland animal style and that of the

Class II Scottish stones may well reflect another: a living continuity growing out of the common background of the early migration period. The motifs of warriors holding two weapons, one in each hand, axes, spears or round shields, bird and animal headed men, riders, centaurs with raised arms, sea-horses, snakes, a deer attacked by two small hounds, all these bear a general resemblance to those on the Scottish stones. Of particular interest are those suggesting the Iranian background of Gothic art, already foreshadowed in the Baltic-Black Sea axis of the Gundestrup style. The two headed horse is a common migration period motif in central Europe and Scandinavia (21); in Scotland, an apparent version is seen of it at Tullibole (22). The bird on fish motif, and the mask head between confronted animals or birds occur not only in Scottish and Irish carving but also in the Anglo-Norman group. The hind with its young of Aldbrough in Holderness and St. Vigean's I is also used on one of the Gallehus horns (fig. 5f), stemming from the same eastern tradition that was the source of its reappearance in the Romanesque style, rather than being directly influenced by a sporadic Scottish example. The treatment of the Gallehus hounds is interesting for they are constantly shown with one leg to represent each pair, and frequently bent forward at the joint in a crouching position, a common feature of the Manx style and also in Scottish and, less frequently, Irish carving; the Durham hounds also have this feature, in complete contrast to the more conventional hounds of the

Tapestry.

The second phase of the Gotland picture stones starts in the eighth century and shows a development from the first group; they are characterised by a mushroom shaped frame, the decoration is at first lightly chiselled and emphasised by colour, while later stones are marked by a growing relief. The main difference is that the symbolism of individual motifs is replaced by narrative scenes of battle, myth and saga in horizontal friezes, frequently with a ship underneath; the animal element is no longer such an essential part. The style remains realistic, in contrast to the contemporary Germanic II and III interlace, and continuity is seen into the tenth and early eleventh century Viking carvings of Man, where there are human figures in identical positions and garments. The human groups of the Scottish II and III stones do not on the whole have such a narrative quality; but the concept of pictorial memorial stones could be attributed to a common source of influence, such as the tombstones and sarcophagi of the Romans. These supply some of the stock themes, the horse and rider, boat and hunting scene, with boar or deer as victim, which appear in areas influenced by late Roman art; the particular popularity of the hunt can perhaps be related to its additional significance in Celtic mythology. Another possible Roman influence lies in the painting of the Gotland stones; there is no evidence that the Scottish carvings were painted, but this has been suggested for the Welsh

ones. (23) A major source for the style and motifs of the Gotland stones is found in the tapestries of the Viking period, showing cult and narrative scenes, and woven in coloured wools, which can also be accepted as an influence behind the Sigurd scenes on the Viking carvings of Man and Northumbria. The hypothesis of a Pictish embroidery tradition is more difficult to accept (24); the stones do not show such unity of subject, there is no material survival of such textiles at all and the tradition of secular narrative tapestry, to which the Bayeux Tapestry itself belongs is more Germanic than Celtic. It is more likely that Scandinavian textiles served as an occasional source for Scottish carving; they are one of the many media that could have been used for the transmission of motifs. The eight-legged horse Sleipnir, used on many of the Gotland stones (e.g. fig. 8a) carrying the dead warrior on his last journey would have appeared on textiles; at Aldbar (fig. 8b) there is an eight legged beast.

The positioning of the figures on the Scottish stones owes something to the survival of Iron Age influence. In the design of the Gotland stones, the Celtic aspect has been stressed in the resemblance to the Gundestrup cauldron with its two horizontal rows of figures. (25) The horizontal element is reinforced in the Scandinavian style by the narrow rectangular shape of the tapestries which could hang as a frieze around the walls of a room. The symbols of the Pictish Class I stones are placed in vertical or horizontal rows because of the

significance of the statement being made. This aspect tends to survive in the wider subject matter of the Class II and III stones, and a range of apparently unconnected animals will be placed in rows - this is also a result of the narrow areas to fill at the side of the cross, while on the Irish shaped crosses, the shafts were used for panelled scenes of Christian iconography. However, the animal ornament on the base panels has the same use of horizontal rows. There is an alternative suggestion that the placing of the rows of figures one above the other in the Irish and Scottish hunting and processional scenes arises from the perspective influence of antique mosaics and east Mediterranean silver (26); the amount of east Mediterranean silver found in Ireland and Scotland at this period does not justify such a conclusion, while late Roman mosaics are confined to England.

There is not total agreement about the chronology of the Scottish monuments, neither about the beginnings of Class I, nor the development of II and III. (27) The span seems to extend from the fifth to the twelfth century, the symbols, and therefore Class II surviving into the tenth century. And there is an extraordinary archaic preservation of the deer, hound and bird groups into the late medieval period on a group of west Highland grave stones, (28), decorated with motifs which would not look out of place on the tenth century Manx cross slabs. The full Romanesque style did

not reach Scotland until the middle of the twelfth century so that those stones of Class III which have a general stylistic resemblance with the earliest Anglo-Norman art in the stiff and clumsy animals carved could represent a parallel proto-Romanesque tradition, developing from similar earlier sources.

The Scottish element in Anglo-Norman art is fairly slight, and the points in common are as likely to have developed from a common source. But the overlap of the styles, and the variety of the Scottish carved animal ornament means that there could well have been some influence: the factors contributing to the Scottish animal style - the dual Iron Age tradition of the Pictish symbols and the parallels with Scandinavian art, developed from Celtic, Gothic and Roman styles; the conversion of the Picts, bringing Irish influence in the interlacing manuscript style, east Mediterranean elements and further Celtic survival; and the coming of the Vikings, which meant the adoption and blending of Scottish and Irish types - these can be included among the origins of the Anglo-Norman animal style.

C. Isle of Man

The art of the stone crosses of Man is an unduly neglected subject. (29) The use of animal ornament is an essential part of the decoration; because the treatment of the animals is a varied one, having affinities with Scottish, Irish and Scandinavian carving, it is again difficult to define a Manx animal style as such, although the different types do occur in association. (See Appendix A for summary of views on the style.)

There are a few interesting points of comparison with the Anglo-Norman style. The hunting scene is a characteristic element of Manx carving; the victims are deer or boars, and they are pursued by hounds, by horse and rider or by a bird; the hounds, sometimes wearing a beaded collar, are shown springing on the back of the deer, or crouched behind it. These motifs are the most popular on the Manx crosses: out of a range of 24 different animal types, they form 20% of animals used, while the deer is the next, with 10%. This does not compare with the Anglo-Norman group, where hounds and deer are only associated at Durham and Shirley. The boar hunt is used at Clifton Hamden, Tutbury and Little Langford; the two latter are particularly significant, for the boar is being attacked by three hounds, at Little Langford one bites at its mouth while another two with beaded collars crouch

behind, while at Tutbury all three dogs are attacking from the front, two of which spring at the boar's upper and lower jaws respectively. This is a position which very closely resembles the scene on Maughold 66 (fig. 6b). At Clifton Hamden, the traces of a broken head by the boar's mouth and underneath the other hound suggest that this might possibly be an example of the same motif. The two dogs springing vertically at the legs of the Shirley deer do not find exact counterparts, but, while the antlered stag is more common, the hind does occur in Manx - at Maughold 72 (fig. 6c) is a row of hinds with a dog springing at them, the same theme as at Shirley. The bird on the back of deer also appears frequently in Manx carving (e.g. fig. 7g) and the whole style of the Shirley slab, which stands rather outside the Anglo-Norman group may be described as Manx. The horse and rider motif is a frequent one, the over large proportions of the rider recalling those of Kedleston and Whippingham. The single riderless horse of Kenninghall, the saddle indicated by two high ridges, finds a parallel at Michael 123, where however the saddle marks have been interpreted as Fafnir's gold hoard (30): the same high ridges are seen on the Durham horse, which is being led by its rider.

The use of the boar is not confined to the hunting scenes; it recurs in association with many other animals as a normal part of the repertoire of the animal artist, in the same way

as it is associated with other creatures at Hognaston and Parwich. This eclectic grouping is used on the majority of the Manx stones, where the animals are shown either in a vertical row, one above the other, or in a frieze parallel to the engraved shaft of the cross. Another creature in common, although not appearing very frequently in either group, is the snake; the Manx type is shown as if seen from above, with both eyes indicated, and the body knotted. (fig. 6d) While the snakes of Swarkestone, Wroxeter and Great Salkeld are shown with bodies which are S-shaped or bent, those of Durham, Newton Purcell and Stratton have a single or double loop in the centre, as if influenced by the knotted form. The use of the snake is a somehow incongruous element in the Anglo-Norman group, as it does not lend itself to the ornamental, symmetrical treatment of the quadrupeds; whereas it fits well into a row of animals. The deer at Bride 97 (fig. 7e) is unusual in that its body is patterned with diagonally incised lines in a criss-cross pattern in the manner of Durham and Peasmarsch, but as this is not a characteristic feature of Manx carving it can hardly be regarded as a potential source of influence; it perhaps represents a simplified version of the more elaborate body decoration of the fully Scandinavian types.

Occasionally animals are shown symmetrically confronted, generally a pair of birds at the top of the cross; while single animals may be shown with the front paw raised as if in the conventional confronted position, or with the head

turned back towards the tail. Features in common with the Anglo-Norman style are not as numerous as they are with the Irish and Scottish groups; the boar and hounds are the most interesting, and must be more than a chance resemblance. That the motif should recur in Staffordshire, Oxford and Wiltshire means that it is not the result of one sculptor having perhaps visited Man and copied the Maughold 66 motif, but is rather the expression of an underlying tradition that this was the accepted way to depict a boar hunt. The motives of the Manx and Anglo-Norman carver, as well as the interpretation of those who saw it were probably different; but the similarity suggests that there were influences in common. These must arise from a common factor which is more important in contributing to Manx art than to Anglo-Norman, since the aspects they share are all characteristic of the Manx style, but rare in the Anglo-Norman one.

In considering the chronology and origins of the animal ornament of the Manx crosses, it is necessary to divide it into three main groups: interlaced, dragonesque creatures of Scandinavian type; naturalistic single animals comparable to those of Scottish and Irish sculpture; and similar types, but with hooked joint spirals, and so resembling those on the Swedish rune stones. These different types cannot be placed in chronological sequence, because they sometimes appear on the same stone - Michael 105 (fig. 6a) shows all

three - although the carver most usually keeps to one style. Nor is any evidence provided from the shape of the stone which varies from a rectangular slab with an engraved ring - headed cross to a free-standing wheel-shaped head; this latter type is on the whole more associated with the interlaced ornament, while the former is seen with both classes of naturalistic animals, but this is not an exclusive division, and the types again appear to be contemporary.

A comparative chronology can be obtained from the interlacing animal ornament of Scandinavian type. Michael 105 Braddan 108 and 109 (31) form a distinctive group with the Jellinge elements of lip lappet, double contour and wavy line of the ribbon shaped body being supplemented by the later 'Mammen' body pelleting of Cammin and Bamberg type, spiral hip, interlacing lappets and almond shaped eye. (32) This type of ornament is associated on the Michael 105 carving with the two other animal styles. On Michael 89 are more Jellinge animals, characterised by almond shaped eye pointing towards the snout, features which can be described as showing Ringerike influence, while on the Michael 90 fragment is a fully Ringerike head. (33) A few further stones show examples of the Jellinge-Ringerike transition, again in association with the more naturalistic animals. Without becoming involved in the elaborate and contradictory chronologies of the Scandinavian style sequence, the

features of this group can be loosely dated from the latter part of the tenth to the middle of the eleventh century.

These dates can also be applied to the other animal carvings, which show little evidence of typological development. These without joint spirals can perhaps be regarded as starting earlier; the style seems to have begun as a result of Irish influence. The fanged monsters of Conchan 62 and 63 occur in isolation, but that of Michael 64 is associated with horse and rider, and hound. (34) These become the most characteristic of the Manx group; the hunter is always on horseback, the hound and deer frequently shown without him. When they have joint spirals, they are generally in a group with other animals with joint spirals; when without, they are generally alone. This might suggest that the hunt theme had a separate and probably earlier origin than the rows of horizontally or vertically placed animals of varied type. Another Irish looking subject is seen on Braddan 69 (35) where confronted, reared up lions bite at a central moustached mask; on the same cross the four small animals in the spaces between the limbs are looking back, and the bodies of two have enmeshing bands around them, a motif which has parallels in north England rather than Ireland. (36) The unusual circular markings around the animal on Conchan 61 find parallels in those with the deer and backward-looking animal on a Yorkshire cross slab. (37)

The geographical position of Man, equidistant between Ireland, north England and south Scotland, makes it possible to understand this mingling of stylistic elements, and accounts for the third form of animal ornament, the rows of naturalistic animals with hooked joint spirals, which seems to be a Viking interpretation of the Pictish lobate scroll. The motifs in common, apart from the general use of a frieze of different types of animal, include a hump-backed bird, bull, both alone and in combat, a long-legged wolf-like creature with clawed feet and the occasional use of confronted pairs at the head of the cross. (see fig. 7) The Manx joint spiral consists of a single line extending from the junction of limb and body, ending in a simple spiral above the limb, sometimes turned in the wrong direction, as if the carver was more concerned to express the look of the thing without properly understanding its function. A possible prototype occurs in the class III Scottish stones for by this time the elaborate lobate scrolls derived from the class I symbol animals have been in some cases modified to two short scrolls above front and hind leg joined by a single line. The Manx type shows no course of development, and remains a somewhat misunderstood version of this type.

The variety in the animal ornament of the Manx crosses arises then partly as a result of the island's geographical position, and mainly through its occupation by the Vikings, whose mobility and widespread settlements made contact with

a number of styles. The use of animal form as ornament cuts through such divisions, forming an 'animal style' of its own, always fluid, and constant in the animal factor alone; so that the animal carvings of Man, made in a limited period and very constricted area, can yet show such variety and reflect the historically attested movements of the Vikings, a satisfying form of archaeological proof. From the style of the carvings, the sequence seems to start with crosses ornamented under Irish and possibly Northumbrian influence; the Irish element survives particularly in the use of naturalistic hunting scenes of the type on the base of the high crosses; a new range of animals characterised by the simplified joint spiral shows the influence of Scotland, while at the same time interlaced animals which form a convincing part of the Scandinavian sequence are also being used. To go beyond the evidence of animal ornament alone, a number of the crosses have forms of Celtic geometric and linear patterns of undoubtedly Irish inspiration; it was from here that Christianity came to Man, bringing with it the concept of erecting crosses. The occupation by Norwegian Vikings dates from the latter part of the ninth century; and while Norway was not converted to Christianity until the beginning of the eleventh century, the use of the earlier Jellinge and Mammen styles to decorate crosses suggests that conversion had been achieved earlier in Man, probably by the late tenth century. The type of ornament also suggests that the first Scandinavian

settlers were Norwegians from Ireland, later to be reinforced by a wave from Scotland; the cross type for the more Scottish carvings has also less Irish parallels. (38) The Viking origin of the majority of the crosses, apart from the varied styles they used, is also attested by the use of runic inscriptions and the scenes illustrating Norse saga, which are the most directly Scandinavian aspect of all, their closest parallels being found in native metalwork, textile design and the carvings of the Gotland picture stones. Carvings of this type occur very sporadically in Ireland and north England which are characteristic of those areas, but obviously the work of an artist trained to work in the Manx style.

A tentative chronology of 950 to 1050 for the majority of the Manx crosses explains both the incorporation of earlier motifs, and the apparent survival of certain elements to influence the Anglo-Norman style; through the agency of the Vikings, such a combination was possible. The boar hunting scene, and general popularity of the boar, and the knotted treatment of the snake are the most Manx traits which occur in Anglo-Norman art; they can be regarded as an expression of underlying Scandinavian influence.

B. Viking England

In north England the use of animal ornament in sculpture resembles that of Man and differs from that of Ireland and Scotland in that, from the early tenth century, it can be quite definitely associated with the Scandinavian settlement of the area. Although the erection of stone crosses was a result of the Vikings' conversion to Christianity, scenes of pagan legend and saga survived and Scandinavian ornament was used. The significance of the area is that the settlement was permanent, so that by the Conquest there was a living tradition of ultimately Scandinavian styles which were to merge with the continental Romanesque influence behind Anglo-Norman architectural sculpture. In the Domesday Survey for Northumberland, the names of the majority of pre-Conquest landowners were Scandinavian (39) and there is no reason to suppose that the stone masons and sculptors would not retain certain traits of the styles they had been trained to; so that the details of Anglo-Norman carving which resemble the pre-Conquest styles of north England could result from the direct influence of this tradition. It was also a tradition which incorporated many of the elements already present in Irish and Scottish sculpture not of Scandinavian origin, providing in this way a more likely means of transmission for motifs which would otherwise present a rather wide chronological and geographical gap.

The earliest Scandinavian settlement occurred in the north east, the five boroughs and Yorkshire, after the 886 treaty between Alfred and Guthrum. The occupants were of Danish origin, in contrast to the Norwegian vikings who settled the north west, Cumberland and surrounding districts, coming from Ireland from the early tenth century. Their different origins can be traced in the sculptural styles of the two groups. Stone sculpture was not a part of Viking art before the tenth century, but was learnt from contacts with Britain. The animal style in the Danish areas of settlement resembles the Jellinge creatures seen on metalwork, characterised by a ribbonlike treatment, double outlined bodies and intricate interlacing details around head and limbs, and is the result of Scandinavian taste being applied to decorate a monument of English type and sometimes treatment.

(40) Certain crosses show a combination of the native style, of a long standing tradition of interlace and basically naturalistic animals, with the Viking purely ornamental technique, and the gradual fusion of styles.

In contrast to these are the carvings of the Norwegian Vikings in the north west, who were already familiar with stone sculpture and the placing of scenes, sometimes in panels, on the shaft. Animals were already significant in Irish cross carving, and the Vikings either copied or substituted their own in association with narrative sculpture

combining scenes of Christian and non-Christian mythology. The Irish high crosses of the late ninth and tenth centuries form the most likely source for the north western group, while the more Scottish influence on the carvings of Man result in the difference between these two Anglo-Norse groups.

Detailed studies of specific areas show the continuity of Viking tradition. In Cheshire (41) there was substantial Norse settlement from Ireland by the beginning of the tenth century, which continued up to the Conquest, evident in the types of cross and the development of motifs; and the post-Conquest survival is illustrated in carvings such as the string course at St. John's, Chester (fig. 1b) which shows fully Scandinavian animal ornament in an early Anglo-Norman building. The style of this is fairly primitive, but the combination of long tendrils with unevenly interlaced body in which the elaborate coils are of more significance than the creatures they grow from suggests a Ringerike to Urnes transition, and a late eleventh century date. The Ringerike style can be dated from the end of the tenth to the third quarter of the eleventh century (42) and is characterised by the use of basically recognisable creatures and a distinctive tendril form of ornament. The St. Paul's churchyard stone (pl. 45) is fairly typical, showing a lion-like creature, enmeshed with tendril-interlace and a snake; the style in England dates particularly from the reign of Knut, although in Ireland it

continues into the twelfth century, and seems to have been introduced at a late stage of development. Amongst the Anglo-Norman group, the Ipswich carvings show the most directly Ringerike influence, although pared of the characteristic fleshy tendrils. Both boar and dragon remain essentially recognisable, in contrast to the surface patterning of Southwell and Hoveringham, where the interlace of the dragons' tails is the most striking part of the design. The joint spirals of the boar, shown by an engraved line, growing from the top of each leg to meet the other curving round into a spiral tip, with a transverse band, find a close parallel in those of the St. Paul's stone; it seems to be an elaboration of the simple spiral hooks of the Manx type, with an ultimately Scottish origin. The dragon however, with the figure of eight tail is a simple version of the themes seen at Hoveringham and Southwell, which are more related to the Urnes style, characterised by slender, curved interlace and dating, in England from after the Conquest and reaching Ireland rather later.

Other Urnes influenced animals in the Anglo-Norman style are those at Jevington, the animal and snake on either side of the rood-like Christ, where the double outline, eye pointing towards the nose and lip lappet are all features of the style, apart from the asymmetric interlacing ribbon like curves.

As well as these five very obviously Scandinavian influenced carvings, other animals of the Anglo-Norman group

shown small points of style which are not otherwise characteristic of a Romanesque background. The dragons at St. Bees and Long Marton have jaws which tend to curl into spirals at the tip, an ornamental detail which compares with that of the Ipswich dragon, and could be a very simplified version of the lip lappet of the later Ringerike style; and at Flax Bourton, the single pointed tooth in the upper jaw of the dragon is an Urnes characteristic, and contrasts with the two rows of jagged teeth of the other dragons of the style. The interlaced snake biting at its own body of Great Salkeld is a recurrent Urnes motif, while the uneven coils can be compared with those of Kirkburn (43).

Apart from these Anglo-Norman carvings which can be compared to aspects of the Scandinavian style sequence, there are a certain number which seem influenced by a more vaguely Nordic tradition, the late tenth and eleventh art of north England, in these areas of Viking settlement which were not necessarily in touch with the styles of the homeland, but which had developed their own style from a mixture of influences.

The Ampney St. Mary tympanum of a feline mask which is surrounded by the coil of its own snake-like body finds a curious parallel at Great Clifton (fig. 8c) where, instead of being shown as a part of a confronted pair, the motif is shown with a small human figure of Viking type crouching ~~on~~

the body. The use of crouching figure, coiled body and interlace, although this time with a snake like head is also seen at Gosforth, Saint's Tomb (fig. 8e). The style of these two carvings might date from the early eleventh century; the interlace suggests a Jellinge to Ringerike transition. The whole group at Ampney will in fact be shown (Section IV) to be inspired by a rather different source, but the origin for this specific motif does seem to have a Viking origin.

The hunting scene is generally shown only by the deer and hound, the hound springing on the deer's back, as at Dacre (fig. 8d). At Gosforth however (44) the hound is shown leaping at a right angle, the position of Durham and Parwich, and elsewhere they frequently occur with only one leg to represent each pair, in a crouched position, a motif which possibly finds an earlier origin in Ireland than in Scotland. The deer is also frequent, both alone and as one of a group of unrelated animals.

The ear biting motif of Clifton Hamden and Monasterboice South Cross is seen on a cross fragment of Durham Chapter House (45) where a serpent enmeshes a feline, the standard Ringerike theme, and bites at its ear. At Whalley, Lancashire (46) is a backward-looking feline with tail which ends in the head of a snake; the headed tail is already seen in Scotland, and in the Anglo-Norman group on felines at Kensworth and Great Salkeld. In this case, the sculptor seems to have misunderstood the

conventional tail position, for it curves down across the back and then behind the legs, a variation recalling the tail of the lion at Southwell, while that at Sinnington is also more elaborate than the conventional Anglo-Norman type.

Of particular interest are a few animals treated in a stiff and clumsy manner, for example at Thrybergh, Mirfield, Brompton, (47) with rigid legs and hanging head, which may be compared with similar types in the Scottish Class III group and the latest Welsh crosses, which are not obviously Scandinavian, but come at the end of the series, and compare closely with some of the earliest Anglo-Norman carvings, as at Darley Dale, Beckford, Shirley and even Durham. They could be almost described as being part of the same style, the difference lying in an architectural rather than cross setting; in fact, the Darley Dale and Shirley carvings are on rectangular slabs, which do not commit them to a functional role. This can be taken as an example of a transitional style where the original vigour has died away leaving on the basic depiction of the animal, which is also that drawn on by the first sculptors after the Norman Conquest before the Romanesque side of the Anglo-Norman style had been fully recognised. It can perhaps be regarded as Scandinavian in that it draws upon the underlying Scandinavian naturalistic tradition which always runs parallel to the ornamental one; but these are animals which have lost all contact with the mainstream of Scandinavian art.

Other details of this group include angularly knotted tails which are weak attempts at more elaborate interlace; the tails of the lion at Leak and the dragons at Ipstones and Old Byland also have this feature, the latter with extra line down the middle, another feature of late Scandinavian interlace. (48) The roughly incised group at Ulgham can also be related to this horizon, and the subject perhaps relates to Norse mythology, being used in a Christian context like some of the cross subjects.

Elements in common with the more typical Anglo-Norman style include occasional confronted pairs, central mask head, the backward-looking tail biting position, raised front leg; and among the subjects, many small birds, riders and even a centaur. These Romanesque aspects of the Viking style arise from the influence of Irish art, drawing on the same east Mediterranean sources which were later to contribute to the continental Romanesque; their use by the Scandinavian inhabitants of England before the Conquest perhaps helped to prepare the way for their rapid spread in Anglo-Norman art. It is significant that the majority of Anglo-Norman carvings which show the influence of the styles of Vikings art do in fact occur in the areas of Scandinavian settlement - the north of England and the Midlands; and these can be regarded as examples of continuity in the animal style in the direct survival of pre-Conquest elements.

Summary

In the Anglo-Norman style of animal carving, which is in so many ways fully Romanesque, there is an underlying minor current of influence from the previous animal styles in Britain, from Ireland, Scotland, the Isle of Man and north England, in which there are three main factors: Christianity, which led to contacts with the east Mediterranean world, luxury goods and an ancient style of animal art; the Iron Age cultures of north west Europe, with animal ornament forming an important part of Celtic and Germanic art; and the coming of Vikings who had their own animal style but also adopted those they came into contact with. These factors are all reflected, in varying degrees of importance in the stone sculpture of the British Isles in the tenth and eleventh centuries; and the aspects of these styles which survive into the Anglo-Norman group indicate one of the origins of the English Romanesque animal style.

SECTION III

THE ANIMAL ORNAMENT OF THE BAYEUX TAPESTRY

The borders of the Bayeux Tapestry contain approximately 530 animals; these are of considerable variety, yet have sufficient consistency of treatment to be regarded as in a distinctive style, and one which compares closely in some respects with the Anglo-Norman group of sculptures. There are also a number of animals in the central portion of the Tapestry, the war horses, hunting dogs and falcons, lamb and cow, which however play a part in the sequence of events and are not there as pure ornament. The borders however, narrow strips above and below the narrative panel and an integral part of the whole design, are there for a decorative purpose; and the ornament chosen to fill them is animal ornament. The vital importance of the Tapestry is that it can be dated with a fair degree of certainty to 1077 (see Appendix B) and therefore establishes a horizon for the use of this particular aspect of the animal style, which is seen in the sculpture group at its most typical at Ely, Milborne Port and Ridlington. These carvings are not a result of the direct influence of the Tapestry border, but can be seen as a part of the sequence of development of the Anglo-Norman animal style with its beginnings in the clumsy confronted figures of Netheravon, Cambridge and Durham and later aspects in the florid pairs of Egloskerry, Swarkestone and others; the Tapestry animals represent a phase

of this style of ornament in which animals were the main subject and were shown according to a particular set of conventions. By studying the animals of the Tapestry in detail it is possible to define these conventions and trace their origins; and the results can be applied to those carved animals which have most in common with those of the Tapestry. While Anglo-Norman animal sculpture is characterised by a wide distribution, a time span of two generations containing very few datable carvings, anonymity and variety of style, the Tapestry borders can be ascribed to one school, in fact probably one hand, working in this distinctive manner at a specific time - it would be too rash to be specific about the exact place. In fact the Tapestry borders represent a particular example of the style, as opposed to the general outline supplied by the sculptures.

The border animals are arranged in the two horizontal strips above and below the narrative action which occasionally overflows into the borders; there are also 4 pairs of ornamental animals inserted into the central panel as space fillers but having nothing to do with the course of events (C 1-4). The animals are divided from one another by slanting lines, either in parallel pairs or pointing towards each other, frequently enclosing foliage ornament, scrolls or small sprigs, which alternate with the animals. Generally one animal is placed in each compartment, but it may sometimes contain a pair. The

animals not infrequently impinge on these dividing lines, with wing, tail or paw touching or passing behind or through it, while some of the birds bite at the foliage of the next section. Sometimes small trees are used to separate the animals; this occurs in one or two of the fable scenes where the tree serves as a comma, rather than the full stop of the slanting line and leafy sprig.

The animals contained in these borders fall into two main groups, ornamental and narrative. The ornamental animals are arranged in symmetrically confronted pairs which are either in separate compartments or, less frequently, share the same one. Occasionally a single animal, of a type more usually seen as a pair, is used; or two pairs are alternated, but the general impression is that of a series of mirror images although the animals are always slightly different from one another in tiny details.

These ornamental pairs form by far the greatest proportion of the border animals. Interspersed with them are motifs of a rather different style and significance - some of these can be identified as scenes illustrating Aesop's fables, while others are motifs seen also in other media at this period. A rather different range of animals is seen on the two groups, and the treatment varies somewhat, the ornamental pairs having more in common with the animals of the sculpture group. The difference between the two aspects must arise from the use of separate sources, a unity of style being naturally imposed as a result

of their depiction by the same artist working within the limitations of embroidery. It is possible, by examining the style and content of these two groups to trace their sources, which are valid for a significant part of the sculpture style.

A. The Confronted Pairs

Of the 530 animals in the borders, only about 80 belong to the fables and other narrative motifs; the rest are arranged as confronted pairs, showing that this form of symmetrical placing was an essential part of the style. The range of animals and the positions they are shown in follow certain rules to which there are a very few exceptions. A third animal can be added to a confronted pair (e.g. A 97, A 101) or a single animal is used (A 225, B 30, B 80) which however are of a type not belonging to the range of confronted pairs and resemble those of the narrative group; a very few single animals more usually seen as pairs are used, which are perhaps a result of the designer's having forgotten to add the partner (e.g. A 141, B 126) but these irregularities are so infrequent that they stress the otherwise consistent arrangement of the confronted pairs.

The most popular creature is the bird; there are 170 examples, which are not of any recognisable species but can be divided into three main types. Bird I, of which there are 68 examples, has a large heavy looking body, neck and legs of

medium length, small head and wedge shaped tail. Its most characteristic position is with the neck bent down to the ground and head turned in to bite at the claw, while the front wings jut forward and the other is furled along the back. 16 pairs are shown like this; another 12 have the head twisting back to bite at the tip of the back wing. The pair A 43 have the necks entwined to bite at each others' wing; A 46 and 47 lean forward to bite the tip of the extended front wing, while the pair at A 60 have the heads stretched right back to bite at the tail. Sometimes they bite at leaves, which may grow from the foliage in the next compartment (e.g. B 24). The foot biting position is only characteristic of Bird I; Birds II and III are far less frequently shown biting the wing.

Bird II, with 76 examples, has a smaller body, relatively large head and virtually no neck. Its legs are quite slender, varying in length, and the tail may be quite long. Only 5 pairs have the head looking back to bite at the wing which is either outstretched or folded along the back. Its most typical position is standing upright with both wings extended (A 187, 188) or with the front wing extended to its partner and head turned back (B 154, 155). Like Bird I, it may have a leaf in its mouth (A 11; B 49, 50).

Bird III, with 20 examples, has the same size of body as Bird II, but is distinguished by a much longer neck and fairly long legs, while its wings are small and insignificant. Only

3 pairs are shown biting at the wing, and the wings are rarely extended. One distinctive position at A 30, 31 with the neck looped around itself and the head looking backwards; or A 29, 30; A 50, 51, with the head turned back and the neck lying along the upper curve of the folded wing so that the outline of the bird is almost circular.

Features in common for all three classes of bird are the treatment of the plumage and of the claws. The wing feathers are indicated by three to five parallel lines along the length of the wing, while the rounded area where the top of the wing joins the body is marked by two parallel lines. The central feather of the extended wing is often shown as the longest, while those nearer the body become progressively shorter. The claws of the feet are always shown in detail, with one or two curved toes to the front and one shorter one to the back; the very large size of the foot is out of proportion with the rest of the body.

Apart from these anonymous ornamental birds, there are a few recognisable types. There are two pairs of peacocks, A 55, and B 192, 193. They are both distinguished by the crown-like tuft of feathers on the head, and by the 'eyes' on the long tails. The latter pair have rather shorter tails and are in the typical position of Bird II with the front wing outstretched and the back one lying along the body. The first pair are not identical, for while the tail of the bird on the left hangs

down, the other's curls up in a manner presumably meant to represent the peacock's tail fully unfurled, but which is more like the tail of the confronted cocks at A 39 and 40; these are distinguished by a comb and wattle and tuft of rear feathers. The cocks and peacocks are the only birds amongst the confronted pairs that belong to distinct species; the similarly vague treatment given to the birds in the fables, which are at least of a known type such as crow or crane suggest that realism was not the main concern of the designer; he only sought to give the general impression of a type of bird. In the fables, the type was known anyway, and for the confronted pairs it was not important. Other variant forms are the pair at C I, which seem to be fighting rather than merely confronted, with claws, beaks and unfurled wings touching; the pair B 204, 205 which are shown almost upside down, with the feet in the upper corner of the compartment; A 148, 149 with the front legs raised high off the ground; and A 208, 209 which would otherwise be conventional Class II birds, but have long leafy tendrils growing from the top of the head.

The next most frequent border animals are the lion and feline, which resembles the lion in every respect except that it lacks the distinguishing mane - it might be originally intended for a lioness, but has become a motif in its own right. There are 64 felines and 76 lions, the total of

140 rather less than the 170 birds of all types. Amongst the lions and felines there are certain characteristic positions and details of treatment which are far less frequently seen on other animals, and can be regarded as typical of lion and feline. On the lions, the placing of the tail is the most significant: in 43 examples it is shown bending down between the hind legs and up over the back, with the tip pointing either towards or away from the head. 30 have their heads in the backward looking position and 19 of these are biting at the tip of the tail. When the tail is not curling up over the back, it hangs down between the hind legs, or bends up and away from the body; the tip varies in shape - it can end in three lobes or a single leaf shape.

Another feature of the lion is to have the tongue protruding from the mouth, this occurs in 17 cases. The front far paw is raised towards the confronted partner in 12 pairs, and generally all four legs are shown standing very firmly on the ground, with the hind legs slightly parted; in a few examples (A 75, 76; B 107, 108) the lion is in a crouched, running position, with hind and forelegs stretched right out. 3 pairs of the lions have the head turned to the front, with facial features clearly indicated and the curls of the mane indicated beneath the chin (A 86, 87; A 234, 235; B 168, 169); otherwise the body is in the conventional paw

raised, tail over back position. The treatment of the mane varies considerably and no particular version can be regarded as typical. Sometimes it is only indicated by bulges in the profile of the neck on either side, to show the tip of the curls (B 187, 188); or it can be a row of three or four tongue-shaped curls which grow from a line running across the base of the neck (A 19, 20) or, more frequently, with no line separating them from the back of the head. It may be arranged in two distinct rows of curls (A 142, 143) or in a confused mass from the top of the head down to the back (A 53). Nor is the mane necessarily indicated by curls; it may be in long straight strands (B 1).

The feet are sometimes shown ending in separated toes with needle-like claws, with the rudimentary toe also marked; but they can also be quite featureless. Like the birds, the lions tend to have feet rather large in proportion to the rest of the body. There seems to be no particular convention for the ears which may be ignored altogether, or one or both shown, either pricked or flattened. The mouth is frequently open, whether the tongue is protruding or not, and a line is sometimes drawn around the jaws.

Apart from the mane, identical features are seen on the felines. Out of 63 examples, 26 have their heads turned to look back, of which 16 are biting at the tip of the tail; only 18 of the tails are shown curled down between the legs

and up over the back, so this seems a trait rather more characteristic of the lion. 14 have protruding tongues and they all share the stance of the lion, either standing squarely on the ground or crouched in the running position. The pair A 23, 24 are unusual in that while the front paw is raised, the hind legs are in a sitting position, one leg stretching forward and the other back; this pair have especially long tails ending in a trilobate tip, which is seen on several of the pairs. B 40, 41 have the heads turned to bite at their backs. The ears have the same variety of treatment as the lions; they are most often shown flattened back.

Then there are a small group which seem like a cross between felines and hounds, but which cannot be confidently described as either. They might be intended to represent a hound treated with the conventions of the confronted pairs, since the other dogs on the border appear only in the context of narrative scenes. These animals are characterised by rather longer legs than those of the lions and felines, with the angles of the joints marked prominently, large triangular ears and squared muzzles. The pairs A 170, 171 and B 172, 173 are in a semi-crouched position, the long tails stretched out behind with the heads looking backwards, the pads of the feet showing, but lacking the distinctive feline claws. B 194, 195 are of the same type, but look towards each other. B 80 stands between two confronted birds at the end of a confused sequence of birds and felines,

but stands with its head pointing upwards like a dog howling to the moon. This is a unique position on the Tapestry, and might possibly be due to a misinterpretation by an over zealous restorer. Two further pairs, A 15, 16 and A 56 have feline claws but otherwise uncharacteristic body positions. The first pair have their backs arched and neck bent down so that the top of the head touches the ground, and the inner front leg stretches up past the body, with the tail held underneath it; the body is decorated with stripes. The pair A 56 are shown sitting on their tails with the front paws raised and touching; the heads are turned back and look down, very closely tucked into the chin so that they are biting the upper part of the back; the ears are wideset and the muzzle rounded.

The next creature in order of frequency is the griffin; there are 21 pairs and ^asingle one. These do not belong to a consistent form; there are two main types, but with variations in each and attributes borrowed from other animals, the difference resulting from whether lion or bird is the more influential model. Type I (e.g. A 21, 22) has the head and beak of a bird, its front legs ending in bird claws with one toe to the back and either one or two to the front, while the hind legs end in the paws of a lion. Type II (e.g. B 42, 43) has the head of a feline with all four legs ending in paws, but there is considerable variety in the treatment of the head which ranges from the birdlike, with ears but beak rather

than jaws (B 196, 197) to indications of a proper lion's mane (B 55, 56). Other forms include A 54, with a head which is neither quite bird nor lion but with both fore and hind legs ending in bird's claws. A 188, 189 are like the bird type except that they have feline ears. The griffins are more uniform in other details: 22 have the tail curling down between the legs and up over the back, in the conventional lion and feline manner, 8 have the head turned back to bite at the tip of the wing, like the birds, although these are not invariably the bird-headed griffins. The wing feathers are treated exactly like those of the birds, being separated by three or four parallel lines with the end feather shorter than the rest and slightly curled at the tip. Two transverse lines stop the feathers where the wing joins the body, but its outlines grow from those of the front leg, the whole limb jutting forward and smaller in size. The body positions vary like the lions; they may be crouched or standing, and the front paw is generally not raised because of the front wing. There is the same variety in the tip of the tail, and the ears, when they occur, may be one or two and pricked or flattened.

Another fantasy animal is the dragon; there are 15 in the borders, 7 pairs and a single one. The dragon has two legs, two wings and stands upright; like the griffin, the treatment varies depending upon the relative influence of feline or bird. The pairs A 79, 80 and A 152, 153 have long

slender necks, birds' heads and beaks and feline paws. With more feline heads, having ears and jaws are B 28, 29; B 37, 38; B 46; B 130, 131, and these all have feline paws, while A 59 has a feline head but the clawed feet of a bird. The tails vary also; the majority are knotted and end in a trilobate tip, like that of the lions and felines, but A 152, 153 have the feathered tail of the bird while A 59, 60 and B 28, 29 end in snake-like heads. The former pair have particularly long tails which curve up, round past the neck and down so that the snakey tip bites at the front claw. The wings of all the dragons are bird-like; one or both may be shown, extended or flat, and the front wing grows from the outlines of the front leg. The protruding tongues are much more elaborate than those of the lion or feline; that of B 28 seems to end in a puff of smoke, B 37, 38 are very long and end in trilobate tips, B 130, 131 are long parallel lines. B 189, 190 have scalloped lines on the body, which successfully represent scales, and A 59 has a central spine drawn along the middle of the tail.

Two further pairs, A 143, 144 and A 150, 151, which are neither quite bird nor dragon might represent the designer's version of a senmurv, the Persian bird-dog. The Tapestry examples are three-quarters bird - the rounded head, with small eye and open beak, which joins directly to the neck and wings are of Bird II type - but the legs stretch forward and end in paws; and the shortened rounded tails are not seen on any of the other birds.

There are two pairs of centaurs. A 37, 38 have the upper part of the body turned to the front; the head is that of a woman as the hair is long and hangs down on either side of the face. The features are clearly shown and the arms extended, ending in large hands with the thumbs uppermost. A line marks the separation between human and animal body, which is that of a horse, with one leg to represent each pair ending in a neat hoof. The figures however are not confronted, for both are facing the right; whether this is a mistake by the designer it is impossible to tell, but they do look out of place amongst the other symmetrical pairs, and the other pair of centaurs, B 5, are confronted. This is in a heavily restored section, but as far as it is possible to tell, they are of quite different type. All four legs of the horse body are shown, the tail bends down between the hind legs, up along the back and ends under the raised upper front leg. The human upper part consists of a short body with widely extended wings on each side and a possibly masculine head seen in profile.

Another exotic type is the pair of winged horses, A 174, 175; their necks stretch down to the ground, where the mouths are shown holding tufts of grass; the two wings rise straight above the back, with the same treatment of feathers and the way in which the wing joins the front leg as the birds and griffins. Another pair which only appear once are the

dromedaries, A 48, 49. The designer has been most successful here, and they are immediately recognisable. The necks are long and thick, leaning forward then bending abruptly up to end in a head with hooked nose and two flattened ears. The body is long, with two small humps; the legs end in ungainly but authentic feet.

While the simply treated birds, lions and felines are the most frequent of the ornamental pairs, there are a few other pairs of naturalistic animals which appear sporadically. The sheep is seen at A 42, 43 and C 2; it is distinguished by the curved horn (perhaps a ram is intended) a heavier body than hound or feline, a straight tail hanging down and legs ending in hooves. The first pair each have the further front paw raised; the second, which are in the central panel, as space fillers, are grazing on the mound representing the castle of Rennes. The heads are held up, and they are plucking at blades of grass in an entirely symmetrical position. The deer, which occurs several times in the context of the narrative scenes, is only used as one confronted pair, A 44, 45. The antlers are treated as slender spiky projections which curve gracefully down from the head towards the back. The legs are also thin and end in small hooves. The animals stand with straight legs; the tails are extremely short.

Then there are a group of completely indeterminate quadrupeds, which are not canine, feline or anything else, and it may be doubted whether the designer had any particular type of

animal in mind. There are about 20 of this creatures, which can be loosely assigned to 4 main types. A 31, 32 are rather like sheep, with the same thickset body and hooves, but lacking the horns, having extremely long tails which extend out behind; they face each other with the front paw raised. B 91, 92 stand in a similar position, but have shorter tails and pricked ears. B 66, 67 have long necks, pricked ears and, on B 66 alone, a protruding tongue; they are crouched, with the heads looking backwards, and have parallel lines filling the back, like the somersaulting pair A 15, 16. A 65, 66 are quite different; they have a long, sinuous body, short legs ending in rounded paws, short neck and small delicate head with two flattened ears. They have a weasel-like quality and in no way resemble the foxes in the fable scenes.

A 104, 105; A 225; B 32, 33 are all marked by their extremely short tails, long necks and very slender legs which end in hooves; they might belong to the deer family. A 225 is a single animal shown leaping between a pair of birds; the other two pairs are confronted, with pricked ears and rather humped back. A group which are neither quite horse nor donkey are the pairs A 182; A 146, 147; A 227, 228. The first pair are linked by a rein which is attached to both mouths; they have large pricked ears, slender legs ending in hooves and long straight tails marked by parallel lines. The second pair have much longer tails which extend horizontally beyond

the backs, and end in a triple strand with tips which curl up; the heads are turned back. The third pair have larger rounded heads, the one on the left turned to face the front. The pair A 63, 64 are perhaps intended for bears; they do resemble the more recognisable bear seen in combat with the knight (B 26). The short legs end in clawed feet, and are in a crouching position, so that the animals seem to be rooting at the ground with open mouths; the backs are ridged, and the tails very short and apparently knotted.

The confronted pairs are significant for a number of reasons: that they should be so important a part of the border decoration, that they are placed distinctively in separate compartments in a long strip; and that they fall into distinct types whose frequency varies considerably. By the large numbers of birds, lions and felines, less use of griffins and dragons and extremely sporadic appearance of others it should be possible to trace the sources which inspired the designer and which were a familiar part of his artistic background; the many points in common between these animals and those carved in stone make such conclusions relevant for the sculpture group. But it is first helpful to consider the rest of the border animals.

B. The narrative scenes

These form the rest of the border animal ornament; the

most important are those which represent scenes from Aesop's fables. The estimates of the exact number of fables illustrated vary from a modest 8 to an improbable 42. (1) The reason for this confusion is that while some of the scenes are immediately recognisable others cannot be satisfactorily attributed to known fables; but are obviously of narrative rather than purely ornamental significance. The recognisable fables in order of appearance and starting with the upper row are:

1) The Wolf and the Crane: At A 89 the bird is shown leaning forward with the tip of its long beak in the wolf's mouth getting the bone from the wolf's throat. Both creatures differ from those of the confronted pairs. The bird has a striped neck and body, a particularly long neck and short legs and does not belong to any of the three bird groups. The wolf is between hound and feline in type, with a long straight tail, quite broad body and flop ears. The fable is repeated at B 11 with the position reversed so that the wolf faces left and the bird right. There is also a slight difference in style, for here the crane is a typical Bird I, with the large body and long neck of that type, and instead of stretching up towards the wolf, it has to lean down as the animal is crouching on the ground. The wolf has a more thickset body, and pricked ears. The difference between these two perhaps arises because the designer is copying the A 89 scene direct from a model, which

would account for the different types of animal, while B 11 is his own version of the theme.

2) The Fox, Crow and Cheese At A 90, the fox, with short, thick legs, a pointed muzzle and pricked ear, faces the right and looks up at the bird, which is shown perched on a sprig of foliage, with the round piece of cheese in its beak. The bird most resembles Bird II in type; it is smaller than the fox, with neat folded wing and slender leg and tail. The scene is also shown at B 8, where the positions are reversed, the bird facing right and the fox left; the fox has its hind legs bent in a crouching position, and the cheese is in mid air between them, having just fallen from the bird's beak. At B 39 is the third version: the positions are again reversed and the cheese is now in the fox's mouth. The bird remains the same in style and position in all three scenes, but this third fox has flop ears, longer tail and shorter body, and is generally more like the wolf in A 89. A 90 shows the two creatures in separate compartments, but in the other two they are contained within the same diagonal border lines. The differences are again possibly the result of one being copied, and the others created by the designer; or possibly there was more than one model, illustrating different aspects of the story.

3) The Ass and the Wolf At A 158, 159 a grazing ass is being watched by a wolf of the same type as A 89. They are in separate compartments, and the wolf is watching the ass from behind two

trees, which give it a furtive look. The story could be that of the ass and the wolf which pretended to be a doctor; while it was examining the ass's hoof, it was kicked and so the ass managed to make its escape. The same scene occurs at B 181, 182, with the animals in the same positions; the wolf however has a spotted coat.

4) The Wolf and the Lamb They occur at B 9, with wavy parallel lines to indicate the stream. The lamb is shown as a nondescript quadruped, with a fairly short tail, and head down as if drinking. The wolf has a thick body and relatively small head; its tail is long and juts out behind.

5) The Bitch and Puppies The scene occurs in identical form at B 10 and B 191. The cave mouth is represented by an arc of parallel lines; from it protrude four heads with pricked ears and open mouths, and facing them, crouched is another quadruped. From the context of the fable they are dogs, but could just as well be wolves.

6) The Lion, Monkey and other Animals The scene at B 12 is most plausibly the tale of the monkey who assembled all the animals to welcome the lion, which is actually by Babrius and not Aesop; (2). On the left, there is another arc-shaped cave mouth in which lies an animal which is most probably a lion - it lacks the mane, but has the distinctive feline tail

position which is not given to wolf or hound. Standing with its head turned back to look at the lion is the monkey, upright like a small human, but with extremely long arms which are extended towards a procession of 8 animals which are advancing towards the lion; the designer has gone to some trouble to depict a variety of types. There are a deer, horse, fox, lamb, wolf, hound and two asses, animals seen on the whole in the fables rather than as confronted pairs.

7) Rat, Frog and Kite B 13 illustrates the moment when the bird swoops on the rat, and so catches the frog as well. The bird has its wings extended and neck pointing sharply downwards, with the head turned in towards the foot in the manner of the confronted claw-biting pairs. But it is biting at the small creature held in the claws, which is shown in profile, as if crouching, with the tail dangling down behind. Its front leg touches that of the frog, which is shown as if seen from above, with all four legs stretched out. The head cannot be distinguished as the material is in bad condition here; the body rises out of the parallel wavy lines which are the designer's convention for water.

9) Wolf, Goat and Huntsmen Like the lion and monkey scene, this is another group which could illustrate more than one fable; but the meaning, how the goat got the better of the wolf and was rescued by the huntsmen, is clear enough. Three

phases of the story are represented, with no margins between them. At the extreme left, standing beside two trees, a wolf stands talking to a goat; then the goat appears again, this time turned to the right with its head up as if bleating to a running man holding two clubs; this figure is repeated, with his head turned the other way towards two pairs of hounds which are pursuing the running wolf up a hill. The wolf is shown throughout with thickset body, long tail and pricked ears; the goat is marked by the beard, and the two long curved horns. The first phase of this fable is perhaps illustrated at A 184, where wolf and goat are again talking, in the same position.

9) The Lion's Share This fable is illustrated in two phases, at B 15 and 16. The first scene shows a row of goat, with distinctive beard and horns, sheep, cow, with head turned to the front, and lion, with curled mane and conventional tail position, all running after the deer which is leaping a little way ahead of them; on the other side of the dividing tree, the lion is crouched on the ground with its head raised to bite at the neck of the deer, which has been brought to a sudden halt, and slumps to the ground. The animals in the first group resemble others in the narrative scenes, but the lion and deer group is unusual; for although it is a very common motif, this particular aspect, with the lion almost underneath the deer seems unique to the Tapestry, and suggests

that the designer was not merely including a familiar group, but had perhaps created this particular version. An interesting feature of this fable is that the tree which divides the two scenes also occurs at the beginning and end, rather than the diagonal lines; the previous fable of the wolf and goat has the same hunting theme, for which the trees are most effective.

10) The Sower and the Swallows B 23 is a group of three scenes, which might conceivably refer to the labours of the months, but in this context can quite plausibly be accepted as illustrating a fable. (3) The first scene shows an ass, the same long-eared type as in the previous group, drawing a plough; the horse in the second scene is the small sturdy type with shaggy mane as in B 12, in contrast to the long-legged, more slender warhorses of the central panel. The birds of the third scene are small and plump with extended wings, unlike the confronted pairs; they are shown in flight.

Apart from these ten groups which can be fairly certainly identified with fables known at this period, there are further scenes of more than ornamental significance which the designer might have expected those who saw the Tapestry to understand. The row of animals from A 120-126 stand out in contrast to the confronted pairs, but they are in separate compartments, and not associated together as if for a fable; the effect is

that of a procession of animals. It starts with two birds, both standing in profile turned to the right, with both wings extended, and not belonging to any of the three Bird categories of the confronted pairs. Then there are a wolf, fox, deer, crouched lion, with mane and conventional tail and finally, facing them all another bird of different type, with a very long neck, thin leg and long tail feathers, generally resembling an ostrich. The other animals are typical of those in the other fable scenes.

An enigmatic group occurs at B 45. The preceding pair of fish, at B 44, and the shoal of wriggling eels are perfectly relevant for the border under the scenes of the river Couesnon; the last two eels however are being gripped by a man lying on his side and holding a curiously curved sword, the pulling motif echoing Harold's action in rescuing the soldier from the quicksand. But the man's foot is grasped by a wolf, whose tail is pulled by a large bird, whose wing is held by another wolf whose tail is being pulled by a centaur. The bird does not particularly resemble any of those of the confronted pairs; nor is the centaur like the other two pairs on the borders, as the animal body is more a feline than a horse. He looks back over his shoulder, and bends the further arm in the curious attitude of the watcher on one of William's ships. As to the meaning of the group, the way in which the creatures are linked together to help the man is important, although sometimes ignored in interpretations of the scene. (4) It is possible that the designer is referring

to some story or legend which the deeds of Harold called to mind at that moment; there are several stories in the Brothers Grimm, for example, which enshrine ancient myth and legend, of how certain animals aided the hero to accomplish various tasks, in which magic weapons also were important, and there is no reason why such an illusion would not have been familiar in the eleventh century.

The pair of fish at the beginning of this sequence face away from each other and linked by a curved line from nose to nose; the bodies are patterned with scales, they have two pairs of fins and forked tails. At B 90 are another pair, shown this time one above the other and turned in opposite directions, lacking in the scales. These can hardly be regarded as belonging to the range of confronted pairs; but the pair of fish was a recognised symbol for Pisces, either linked together or one above the other in the manner shown. The second pair might again be intended to symbolise water, since they are associated with the border ships of the threatened invasion foretold by the comet and occur before the scene of a ship crossing the channel. One ingenious suggestion is that the use of the Pisces motif is intended to refer to the months when these events took place, the Couesnon crossing being in February or March, and the news of Harold's usurpation reaching William at the same time of year. (5) However, the comet, which occurs just before the second pair

of fish, was not seen until April. A similar chronological interpretation has been made of the sower and swallow group, B 23, which were meant to suggest that the events above them were taking place in the autumn, which would be the time of Harold's arrival in France. (6) But in fact the three scenes show farming activities over a number of months indicating if anything a long passage of time, while the scene above them is the brief conversation between William's messengers and Duke Guy.

The other animals on the border, which neither belong to the fables nor the confronted pairs occur in scenes of originally narrative significance which had been accepted as purely ornamental. B 26 shows a warrior kneeling on the ground, holding kite-shaped shield and brandishing a sword at the bear which is advancing towards him. It has a heavy, powerful-looking body and head, large feet, a rough hide and ridged back; it is attached to a tree by a long string tied to its muzzle. (7) B 27 shows scenes of the hunt; on the extreme left a huntsman stands with curved horn raised to his lips; in his other hand he holds a pair of hounds on a leash, and in front of them, running free, are a further pair. Two trees divide the action, then another two dogs are shown with their victim between them, whose throat is gripped by the further dog. The animals should be a deer, but has horns which are like those of the goats on the border. Then there are a further pair of hounds, wearing collar and bell like those that accompany Harold on his journey to France standing

side by side, the designer not showing the full number of legs, a device he also uses on the groups of war horses to lessen confusion which spring towards the central group. Behind them gallops a horse, its rider waving a club in the air. In the central panel above is the scene of Guy and Harold, holding hawks, riding to meet William; while not actually hunting, there is an association of ideas.

At B 123, between two pairs of confronted birds is a hound leaping at a small animal, resembling in size and treatment the rat in the fable at B 13. The frequency of hunting dogs in both borders and central panel show their popularity as a decorative subject, and there is no particular reason to associate this pair with a fable. B 174 shows a bird swooping with wings extended and claws tucked under the body on to a rabbit, recognised by its long ear and very short tail. This can be related to a whole range of predatory bird motifs. At B 198 and 199 there are two more 'hunting' motifs; in the former, a spotted feline makes off with a goose, which it grips in its mouth by the long neck; in the next compartment a fox has caught a hen. Both animals are running to the right, and their victims are flapping their wings and are open-beaked as if crying for help. The fox and hen are perhaps a reference to the Reynard epic; the sight of fox or cat making away with domestic fowl would be a familiar situation, and one which became enshrined in literature as it did in art.

There remains one motif among the confronted pairs which may have a more than ornamental significance; the animals at B 7 which directly precede the long fable sequence in this row. They are wolves of the fable type, with heavy bodies, pricked ears and long tails, and do not otherwise appear amongst the confronted pairs. They each have the further front paw raised to be licked by the long tongue which curls out of the mouth, a position not otherwise seen on any of the border animals; it is possibly referring to the Bestiary attribute of the wolf which is said to lick its paws before hunting so as to make no noise.

Some writers have suggested that the use of fable and narrative scenes is intended to relate to the central panel and point the moral of the events depicted there. (8) This view does not stand up to detailed study. For a start, the sequence of events leading up to the battle of Hastings provide their own moral and need no underlining; and as there are so very many events shown, wherever a fable is placed it could seem to refer to what is going on above or below it. Yet the placing of these scenes is so haphazard - one sequence near the beginning of the lower row and the rest scattered over upper and lower borders - and in fact the scenes of most importance do not have fables near them. For example, Harold swearing his oath on the sacred relics would surely be a chance for a relevant border fable, if one was needed;

but above and below there are only the confronted pairs which form so much more a characteristic part of the border ornament. Some of the fables can be interpreted in several ways, and could refer to almost any moment on the Tapestry. What is more likely is that the designer, having planned borders decorated with animals was bringing a little variety to the rows of symmetrical pairs which do not follow any specific pattern, so that no deliberate scheme was interrupted by the addition of an occasional animal fable. The designer's main concern was the sequence of events in the central panel: the borders were merely an ornamental device to contain them. The fables and narrative scenes did have meanings of their own, but they were not meanings that were meant to be studied as an integral part of the story of Norman Conquest. To have done so, to have had these sporadic, inconsistent interruptions, divorced from the central strip would have been a grave error of design. In the great battle sequence, the lower border is taken over by scenes of fighting and carnage but these are merely side-comments; the rows of marching and running soldiers and twisted bodies are treated almost ornamentally, and are not relevant to the actual progress of the battle, the gradual victory of the Normans. And apart from this section, the borders are almost exclusively animal, interspersed with the diagonal dividing lines and foliage motifs. The designer's intention was to have purely decorative borders; to achieve this he drew upon the current ornamental animal motifs. Some happened to illustrate Aesop's

fables, others showed hunting and combat scenes, while the majority consisted of identically confronted pairs. The choice of an almost exclusively animal repertoire is significant; a unity of style is imposed by the limitations of the medium, but the animals are drawn from two widely differing sources.

C. The Origins of the Animal Borders

This duality can be seen in the points of contrast between the confronted pairs and the narrative groups. A different range of animals is shown; the confronted pairs tend towards the exotic, the fables deal with more familiar animals - fox, wolf, hound, sheep. And those of the pairs have a range of set and stylised body positions which are not on the whole characteristic of the other group, who are taking part in events and therefore not so ornamentally treated. Even those which are common to both groups are not treated identically: the birds of the fables are quite different from those of the pairs in size, shape and position. The animals of the fables which also appear as pairs, such as sheep, deer and wolf, are extremely rare as the latter. This dichotomy suggests that the animals are the result of two quite different traditions.

The fable scenes have been studied in greater detail than the confronted pairs, but no acceptable conclusions have been reached about their source of origin, because of

various assumptions which are made about the designer. (9) In order to prove that the fable scenes were inspired by one specific illustrated manuscript, it is first necessary to define the exact number of fables in the border - and this is not something which can be done with complete confidence. Then one must accept that the designer copied all his fables from the one book, which again cannot be proved either way; but the fact that there is variety in the depictions of the same fable, such as the Fox and Crow, Wolf and Crane, and Ass and Wolf suggests that more than one model could have been available. And the disposition of the fable scenes does not suggest a deliberate copy from one work. While the group B 8 - 15 might be inspired by one set of illustrations, the scatter of the same and different scenes elsewhere on the borders should then suggest that further book sources were at hand. And all this depends on the primary assumption that the designer was copying, rather than creating, and copying from manuscript illustrations. While many of the figures in the Tapestry, both in the borders and the central panel can be compared with figures in English manuscripts of the second half of the eleventh century (10). Normandy at this period closely reflected the English style, and although the manuscript drawings could be described as stiffer and clumsier, lacking the English sketchy lightness of touch, the different technique of embroidery and the heavier outlines of the figures

make it impossible to say whether an English or Norman manuscript was the hypothetical source. A possible origin for the border narrative groups may be found in manuscripts containing calendar and constellation illustrations, while one such as the Leyden Adhemar (II) combines constellation and fable scenes. The designer presumably had access to many books of this kind from which he could draw all the motifs he needed.

He did not even have to be copying from a manuscript illustration; the fables were sufficiently popular by this period to stand alone as motifs without an accompanying text, and they were not only used as manuscript decoration. On the Flabellum of Tournus (12) there are several scenes from Aesop, including the Fox and Crow, and Wolf and Crane; this fan can be dated to the first half of the ninth century, and is marked by the richness and variety of its animal ornament, which also includes confronted symmetrical pairs. The origins of its style lie in the influence of the Carolingian revival of late Roman forms, the Aesop scenes in particular deriving from the same kind of source as the Leyden manuscript, the copying from a fifth century original, while the other animals, the centaurs, sirens, elephants and so on may show the influence of an illustrated Physiologus, while the confronted pairs reflect the decoration of oriental textiles. The main significance is that already the fable illustrations are standing alone without the explanatory text; this custom is extended in France by the eleventh century, if not carrying on

an earlier tradition, to wall paintings.

At St. Savin sur Gartempe (13) where the wall paintings ~~have been dated to the~~ late eleventh century, there are striking parallels to the Tapestry: the decoration of the nave is carried out in narrow friezes, the sections being separated from one another by trees and foliage ornament, as in the Tapestry central panel and borders; and also by scenes from Aesop, which in style resemble those of the Tapestry more closely than do the human figures. The two surviving fables are the Fox and Crow, and the Cat hung by Mice. That such fables were an established precedent for religious decoration in France is shown by the abbey of St. Benoit-sur-Loire, where the walls of the refectory were decorated in 1030-32 with scenes from Aesop's fables. (14) A most curious echo of this tradition is seen in the monastery at Eski Gumus, Turkey (15) where, in a room over the narthex, one of the walls has a painted frieze including illustrations of Aesop's fables, among which are the Wolf and Crane, Fox and Goat, and Eagle caught by its own feathers. The other wall paintings there date from the late eleventh to early thirteenth centuries, and have Armenian and Byzantine parallels; a manuscript source would seem the most likely prototype for the fable groups.

These examples show that Aesop's fables were recognised subjects for wall painting in a religious context and that, at St. Savin, they could be used as an ornamental frame for the main text, in this case being placed between sections rather than

above them. The long narrow frieze was an accepted convention in mural painting, possibly even copying a wall hanging of the Tapestry type. Such wall paintings would find inspiration in manuscript illustration - Fleury was known to possess manuscripts of Aesop and Avianus - and might even have served as the medium for the Tapestry fables, which need not have been copied directly from a hypothetical manuscript, but might have been inspired by a wall painting cycle. The range of colours in the Tapestry and the slight stiffness of style do find closer parallels in the mural painting tradition rather than manuscript art, although this was still the original source behind each.

Nor were Aesop's fables the only means of transmitting animal lore of classical origin into the art of the middle ages. There was much Greek and Latin literature on monsters and marvels, enshrined in the *Physiologus*, a second century compilation by Alexandrian Greeks, translated into Latin, and widely diffused in the fifth century, with Ethiopic, Armenian, Syriac and Arab versions; that of the early seventh century Isidore of Seville became the chief source for the authors of the medieval bestiaries, who adapted these compilations to a Christian significance, in the same manner as the fables. The earliest Anglo-Saxon bestiary dates from the eighth century, and surviving examples show a continuity into the Anglo-Norman period. (16) These illustrated books should also be kept in mind as a possible source for the more exotic monsters of Irish and Scottish carving.

While the ultimate source of the border fable scenes cannot be traced beyond an origin in the late classical period, some of the other narrative motifs supply evidence of a more ancient origin, a conclusion which is reinforced by the greater part of the border ornament, the confronted pairs. The use of animals as textile decoration, the fact that they form an ornamental border and are arranged in separate compartments in symmetrical pairs, the range of types and the positions they are shown in are all facts which relate the animal style of the Tapestry to that of the woven and embroidered textiles of the east which had been a source of influence on western European art for two or three centuries before the Norman Conquest; but it was not until the Romanesque period that they became the major source for animal ornament in architectural sculpture.

The specific parallels between the Tapestry style and these textiles will be considered in the next section; the significance of the border animals for the Anglo-Norman sculpture group is that they show how strong the influence was, whereas in stone carving it was frequently more indirect, and was only one of the origins of the Anglo-Norman sculpture style. There are however a number of carvings which are of the same style as the Tapestry border, and others which show a certain degree of influence, and it is these which have most in common with continental Romanesque animal carving because they are influenced by the same source - not the Tapestry but the style which it represents.

In comparing the border style with that of the sculpture group, those having most in common are the confronted pairs. In the Tapestry however, about four-fifths of the animals are arranged as confronted pairs, while only half of the carvings are; and in the Tapestry all these pairs are identical animals, while a quarter of the carvings consist of different animals confronted - their position shows the influence of the symmetry necessary on woven fabrics, but their choice is no longer bound by this convention. Even the Tapestry does not strictly reproduce it all the time, as some of the animals are shown either singly, in alternating pairs or in a row of three. Something of this is reflected in carvings like Stottesdone and Wroxeter, with three animals in a row, and the early single felines of Barnetby-le-Wold or Stanton, which are normally part of the confronted pair.

There is a certain amount of difference in the relative popularity of motifs; on the Tapestry, the most recurrent confronted pairs are birds, whereas they cannot be regarded as the most typical of the sculpture group where single birds, or those in groups of other animals are more frequent. Aspects in common however include the backward-looking, wing biting position, at St. Bees and Alton on single birds and at Kensworth on a confronted pair; birds with both wings extended, at Acton, Alveston, Ideford, Ely and the pair at Little Bytham; the curious upside down position at Alton and Bramber; biting at foliage at

Lower Swell and Wroxeter; the peacock at Fridaythorpe; the bird preying on bird at Ribbesford, which is in the same range of predatory motifs as the bird on rabbit of the Tapestry. The birds most closely resembling the style of the border pairs are those at Bondleigh and Ely, which have the same treatment of the wing and tail feathers and the particularly large three-toed claws.

Almost as popular as the birds are the lions and felines of the Tapestry, and these form the most recurrent animals of the sculpture group; but with rather more felines than lions, while on the Tapestry there are more lions than felines. This perhaps results from the simplification of stone carving, when the distinguishing mane tends to be ignored. The characteristic positions are shared between both groups, and the backward-looking animals biting the tip of the tail, which generally curves down between the legs and up over the back are faithfully reproduced in stone. The delicate mane treatment of the lions is seen in some carvings, noticeably Ely and Milborne Port, with a single row of tongue-shaped curls, Lathbury with two rows and Ampney St. Mary with the whole neck decorated. The position of head turned to face the front while the body is in profile is rather more characteristic of the carving group, appearing on 7 pairs and 3 single felines, but only on 3 of the border pairs. The seated felines of the Tapestry with very long tails, between the legs and up over the back are also seen at Durham and Ely, and the leafy or lobate tail tips

are seen on both groups. The protruding tongues and raised front paws are also characteristic; as the carved pairs are not on the whole separated by foliage or dividing lines, these raised paws often touch, a position which can be extended into a more ferocious form of combat, an attitude also seen amongst the dragons. The hound/feline Tapestry types are also seen in stone, particularly at Wordwell and Stockton; but the unrecognisable monsters of Alveston, Swarkestone and Fritwell have no parallel.

The dragons are the next popular in the carved group, with 9 confronted pairs, 12 examples of the saint and dragon combat and 8 single dragons. The proportions are rather less on the Tapestry, with only 7 pairs and a single one. In both groups there is some variety of type, the dragon at Ideford comparing most closely to the Tapestry pair A 59, 60, with the long tail bending up and round, coming down in front of the head; two of the Tapestry pairs have tails ending in snakeheads, which is an attribute of some of the carved dragons. The long triple-barbed tongues of the dragons at Ipswich and Moreton Valence are seen on the pair B 37, 38. The carved dragons are of a more monstrous type while the Tapestry ones are delicately treated with bird-like details, slender necks and wings; those of Wynford Eagle and Eggleton are the nearest in style.

It is curious that while the griffin appears on the Tapestry

more frequently than the dragon, it is extremely rare in the sculpture group, only occurring at Ampney and Ridlington as one of a pair, and at Milborne Port with a warrior; conversely the mermaid, with 4 examples in stone, is not used at all on the Tapestry, despite the otherwise varied choice of motifs. The centaur is common to both, rather more frequent in stone where it generally confronts another animal and has a bow and arrow, in contrast to the weaponless ones of the borders; it is perhaps significant that the pair A 37, 38 have the upper body, with long hair and raised arms, of the carved mermaids, as if these were somehow interchangeable attributes; that at North Cerney is also in the orante position.

The animal style at Ely comes closest to that of the Tapestry; apart from the choice and treatment of animals, the small sprig of foliage separating the lions is like those between the majority of the Tapestry animals, while the compartment made by the capital face holds either one or a pair of animals. At Fritwell there is a similarly small sprig, but otherwise on the sculpture group, a tree is used to divide the identical pairs, with its own symbolic significance as the Tree of Life.

As well as the confronted pairs, some of the more narrative border subjects have aspects in common with the stone sculpture. The hunting scene occurs in the border as a part of the fable and other groups; the deer (and in the fables the wolf) is the object of the hunt, as opposed to the boar of 3 of the carvings.

At Durham however it is the deer; and there the huntsman is holding a pair of hounds on a lead, like those in the border hunt scene B 27; the leaping hound at Ashford with its legs sharply bent forward is also like those in this scene. Although the fables figure prominently in the border, there is little evidence that they contributed to the sculpture style; the birds at Bramber and Kensworth do have their beaks in the mouths of animals, in the manner of the wolf and crane, but in these examples it seems to illustrate a fight, in the same way that some of the confronted pairs have been subtly changed to fighting pairs. The convention for showing the cave mouth in the fable of the Bitch and Puppies, B 10, as an arc shape is also that of Beckford, which on other grounds can be derived from a manuscript source.

On the whole, those carvings which have most in common with the animal style of the Tapestry belong to the earlier Anglo-Norman period; and the borders can be regarded as representing an early phase of the Anglo-Norman animal style. The different media account for much of the variety in treatment: the stone carver was more affected by other sculpture styles, the Tapestry designer by other two-dimensional, coloured animal ornament in manuscript and textile. But the aspects in common are those which are at the same time characteristic of both: the popularity of the confronted pair, and a particular use of felines, who have a strictly defined range of body positions. In the

Tapestry, birds are of equal importance, in the sculpture group dragons - this possibly results from the underlying Scandinavian influence on the sculpture style, reflected sometimes more directly, and also the significance of St. Michael the patron saint of the Normans. The main differences between the two are a more obvious use of manuscript sources for some of the Tapestry scenes, while a number of the carved motifs are taken from the previous British sculptural tradition. But the origins of the Tapestry animal style can also be regarded as contributing to the Anglo-Norman sculpture style; and the source of the confronted pairs lies in the animal art of Iran.

Another rather hypothetical eastern source of influence on the Tapestry is the fact that it might represent a textile version of a sculptured narrative frieze to decorate the outer or inner walls of a church. Recent excavations at Winchester (17) have revealed a slab which the excavator believes is part of a frieze running round the exterior east wall of the Old Minster. The surviving figures bear a considerable resemblance to the Tapestry in style and treatment; the slab had been discarded in the demolition of the Old Minster in 1093, at a time when the late tenth century tower may also have been destroyed. There is some documentary evidence that the storeys of this tower were also decorated with narrative friezes, and these can be compared with other surviving fragments to suggest that there was a definite pre-Conquest tradition of architectural sculpture

expressed in the form of roods and friezes in which animal ornament played a part. (18) Evidence for a similar pre-Romanesque tradition exists in France, with eleventh and twelfth century survivals. (19) The closest parallels to this form of architectural decoration, combining human figures, animal and foliage ornament are in Armenia at the church of Achtamar; this reflects Byzantine and Sassanian influence, among which textile ornament played a significant part.

But even if the sculptural frieze is of eastern origin, the narrative hanging has firm roots in north west Europe; the long narrow strip with ornamental borders, made of linen with woollen embroidery in laid and couched technique may be considered 'a style of work which was characteristically Viking, Anglo-Saxon or Norman, or common to the Norse peoples who were in close contact with one another'. (20) The use of animals as border ornament is however rare (21) and not a part of this tradition; but it was an integral part of the style of the woven textiles of the east.

As to the style of the whole Tapestry, the main arguments for an English origin rest upon the well-documented examples of Anglo-Saxon needlework, the many points in common with Anglo-Saxon manuscript illustration and in the use of the crossed D and the forms of proper names in the inscriptions. The great reputation and popularity of English embroidery at this period is not in itself sufficient evidence for such an attribution.

Although there can be found detailed accounts of pre-Conquest embroideries presented to churches, these were essentially private commemorative gifts, and not a large professionally made work on the scale of the Tapestry: on the Continent, there was a well-established industry of weaving and embroidering in the monastic workshops. In 840 the Bishop of Auxerre ordered tapestries to be made for the decoration of his church; in the tenth century at the Abbey of St. Florent of Saumur, there are records of many tapestries woven by the monks, and in 985 Abbot Robert ordered a quantity of woven furnishings including two pieces of tapestry, one ornamented with lions and another with elephants. In the eleventh century the monastery of Poitiers included portraits and scriptural subjects, and Leo, an Italian bishop ordered a 'tapetum mirabile' from the Count of Poitou. The process continued into the twelfth century: in 1130 hangings were ordered for the church by the Abbot of Saumur for the choir where there were displayed at high festivals scenes from the Apocalypse, while the nave was decorated with profane subjects, lions, centaurs and other animals. (22)

There is perhaps a fusion of traditions in Tapestry, in that the Norse idea of the narrative embroidered hanging has been merged with the continental use of animal ornament, with the particular influence of the woven technique being reflected in the disposition of the confronted pairs. A work of the size and scope of the Tapestry would require considerable organisation, space, raw materials and labour, quite apart

from the artistic skill, knowledge of Latin and recent events and access to manuscript and textile models; there can be little doubt that it was made in a professional workshop which, whether in England or France, was the monastery, and it cannot therefore be attributed to the skilled hands of English needlewomen.

Nor are the parallels with Anglo-Saxon drawing conclusive. In Norman manuscripts of the late eleventh century there are close imitations of the Anglo-Saxon style in all kinds of ornament (23), and the rather different technique needed for embroidery makes any stylistic determination on these grounds impossible.

As for the inscriptions, they can be attributed to an Anglo-Saxon speaker; but while the ornamental and figural design of the Tapestry, the borders and central strip have obviously been planned at the same time by the way that they frequently overlap, the battle scenes overflowing into the borders and the border figures sometimes relating to the central action, the same cannot be said for the inscriptions which have obviously been written afterwards. The letters of words are recurrently shortened and cramped together so as not to impinge on the figures; although the normal plan is to have one line of writing immediately below the upper border, words are occasionally written under this, such as when a tall figure interrupts the sequence, or they can even be split in half and continued on the other side of the figure. It was not necessary, in manuscript illustration,

for the scribe and the artist to be the same person, and this must also be the case with the Tapestry. While the animal ornament of the Tapestry has much in common with that of Anglo-Norman sculpture, sharing one its origins, it is not entirely identical; this, combined with the evidence above, could suggest that, while the inscriptions can be attributed to an Anglo-Saxon speaker, the artistic designer of the Tapestry was a Norman who, although accomplished in the style of Anglo-Saxon drawing, was also fully aware of the Romanesque animal style derived from Persian textiles which appears in England as a result of the Norman Conquest.

Summary

The borders of the Bayeux Tapestry are important in the study of the Anglo-Norman animal style because they can be dated to 1077, confirming the fairly early position of those carved animals which most resemble them, and because they show the significance of an animal style in its own right. The majority of the ornament consists of confronted symmetrical pairs of animals, of which birds, lions and felines are the most frequent, while griffins and dragons are also typical. The rest of the ornament consists of more narrative animal ornament, with a number of scenes illustrating Aesop's fables. The borders are not identical in style to the carved animals; the differences arise out of the different

media, and the effect of pre-Conquest animal sculpture on the latter group. But the style of the Tapestry animals does compare closely to the Anglo-Norman group in the popularity of confronted animals in a particular range of types and positions, and their origins can be regarded as the same. The Tapestry borders show more clearly where this type of animal art originated; for they are embroidered versions of the originally woven confronted pairs of animals of Persian, and specifically Sassanian influence, which were to play a vital role in the development of Romanesque sculpture. The Tapestry cannot be definitely proved to be of English or Norman manufacture, but it seems possible that the designer was a Norman, and his choice of border animal ornament reflected the continental Romanesque style which was one of the main factors behind the Anglo-Norman animal style, and was brought to England as a result of the Conquest.

SECTION IV

THE SURVIVAL OF THE IRANIAN ANIMAL STYLE

Out of the approximate number of 100 animal carvings which have been described as being in the ANGlo-Norman style, more than half have traits which suggest that directly or indirectly they were influenced by the ornament of the woven and embroidered textiles of eastern origin which were such an important source for Romanesque art; and the Tapestry borders show the Anglo-Norman version of this ornament in its original medium. 'Persian' is a rather indefinite term for the style which was of a far wider distribution than the mere geographical area, the animal ornament having been adopted by the Arabs and spread to all parts of the Moslem world. Nor was it an ornament which belonged exclusively to embroidered or woven fabrics; it was the textile version of the Iranian animal style, whose effect on the west was achieved through the specific influence of Sassanian art.

A. The Sassanian Animal Style

"Sassanian art represents the last phase of an oriental art that had been in existence for four millennia". (1) The continuity of the Iranian style and its most characteristic aspect, the use of a symbolic, symmetrical animal ornament is the result of its revival in the Sassanian period. The Iranian style was also the major source of all other forms of animal art

in western Asia, and the influence also reached north and west Europe in a series of waves. The Persian influence on Romanesque art was one of the latest stages of the process by which the west adopted and adapted an animal art which had originally been developed to express Iranian astral symbolism. (2) The relationship between this style and that of the Eurasiatic nomads was a very close one, much of nomadic animal art developing as a result of specifically Iranian contacts; and in north west Europe, before the Romanesque period, forms of animal ornament were already current which showed aspects of this Eurasiatic influence, and were being assimilated into more local styles.

The animal art of the Sarmatians had a far-reaching effect on the art of the migration period. Formed by the blending of the Eurasiatic Scythian style with the particularly Iranian influence of Achaemenid Persia in the use of polychromy, the popularity of animal combat groups, a more naturalistic treatment of single animals and a number of individual motifs, (3) this style was widespread in south Russia up to the third and fourth centuries A.D. There were considerable contacts between the Baltic and the Black Sea, so that the Gothic tribes, of ultimate Scandinavian origin, after their long residence in the Black Sea area spread the style back to north and west Europe; and a particular reflection is seen in south Scandinavian art, where the Gundestrup cauldron, Gallehus horns, other metalwork and the early picture stones show the adaptation to an Iron Age iconography of the Sarmatian animal style,

including such recurrently Iranian motifs as the predatory bird, the man between two animals and the two-headed creature, motifs which received constant reinforcement from the east, especially after they were sanctioned by Christian interpretation; these were to become common in the Romanesque period.

The second phase of Iranian influence in Europe was with the beginnings of the Merovingian style in the fifth century, when the Visigoths had spread the same Sarmatian elements westwards from the Pontic area. The range of animal types and treatment in Merovingian art have the same Iranian basis as those of the Black Sea area and of Scandinavia. In the sixth and seventh centuries later developments of the Eurasiatic style reached the west as the result of the Hunnic and Avar invasions from the steppes. The Germanic style of animal ornament reflected some of these aspects, with the result that some writers have even claimed a Scythian origin for it (4), although the whole style is more satisfactorily interpreted as arising from the animal ornament of late provincial Roman metalwork (5). The linear, interlacing ornament used the animal form merely as a starting point for the ribbon-like fantasies that developed; this western preference for abstract ornament, in which the original naturalistic or symbolic theme cannot immediately be recognised, remained virtually unaltered in Scandinavia, but in the rest of west Europe tended to be overwhelmed by the animal motifs that came in the wake of east Mediterranean

Christianity.

Merovingian art was formed by the blending of a number of styles, pagan and Christian, in which the influence of Coptic Egypt was particularly significant, contributing also the interlace that characterised the second phase of the Germanic animal style. The gradual spread of Syrian and Byzantine influence also had an important effect, although in remote areas the original east Mediterranean source might suffer a progressive disintegration and abstraction - as is the case in so many Irish manuscripts, where the Coptic, Italian or Syrian model is almost unrecognisable under Celtic spirals or Germanic interlace. With the increasing stability of the church and growth of national states in Europe the Eurasiatic impulses became weaker, and this source for the Iranian animal style ceased to affect Christian art.

But the style survived in the art of Sassanian Iran; and by its adoption into the Byzantine textile industry and into Islamic art, it was enabled to reach western Europe and serve as the major source for Romanesque animal ornament. Sassanian art played a vital role between east and west, and between ancient and medieval art: "in the series of ornamental developments that radiate from Sassanian decoration as the common point of departure, Islamic design on the one hand and Romanesque on the other represent two extremes directly opposed to one another. Caucasian, and specifically

Georgian ornament, and the Byzantine style are morphologically intermediate between these two these are the chief developments in ornament, the elements of which are of Sassanian derivation". (6)

Under the Parthian rulers of Iran, up to the third century A.D., a transition was made from the Hellenising, Graeco-Iranian style which had arisen as a result of Alexander's Conquest to a more traditional style, imbued with realism, linear treatment and frontality; under the Sassanian dynasty, these trends continued, with an almost self-conscious revival of ancient Iranian form, especially in the use of a symbolic, heraldic animal ornament which repeated the themes of Susa, Elam and Luristan in the use of identical pairs confronted by trees, friezes, associates and attributes of the gods, combat motifs and the great hunting scenes which, like scenes of battle, were intended to commemorate the power, divinity and eternal victory of the god-king. The alleged astral connections of the royal house gave an added meaning to the use of symbolic animals, which both formed familiar and popular ornament and referred to the royal divinity. These motifs were used in stucco decoration, a distinctively Sassanian medium, the rock reliefs of ancient Iranian type, the wall paintings and mosaics resulting from Syro-Roman influence, but adapted to Sassanian taste and, from the sixth century, a flowering of the luxury arts - elaborately engraved gold, silver and

crystal vessels, and embroidered and woven fabrics. While animal ornament is used on all of these, it is most characteristic of the last category, the luxury goods, which obviously had most influence on other art styles because of their portable nature and value.

Even before the Sassanian period, there was a well-established textile tradition in Persia: Pliny mentions that the Romans thought highly of the handwoven 'Babylonica stromata', tapestries showing hunting scenes and mythological animals, (7) while the Battle of Issus mosaic at Pompey shows a design of griffins on the garment of one of Darius' men (8). Examples of the Achaemenid and Parthian textile industry can be seen in the princely Altaic burials of Pazyryk and Noin Ula, where the animal friezes, combat motifs and range of types on the carpets and hangings illustrate the tradition that was to be continued in the Sassanian period. (9) A new trait was the placing of animals in roundels, and the symmetrically confronted pair; the range of subjects also included Hellenistic motifs deriving from the Parthian period. Up to the middle of the sixth century, Persia had had the monopoly of the Chinese silk trade; in the Sassanian period, the silk industry received great encouragement, and colonies of Syrian weavers were established in the Iranian provinces, whose styles also affected woollen fabrics and embroidery. The rock reliefs

of Tak-i-Bostan, depicting the glory of the royal house show a range of about two dozen textile patterns decorating the garments of the kings and their followers (e.g. Pl. 46) while similar garments are illustrated on silver vessels (10). But the evidence of these is not needed, because very many fragments survive; the most popular subjects were the lions, eagles, ibex, winged horses and griffins of earlier Iranian art; motifs resulting from the more classical Syrian and Byzantine influence, the horse rider as huntsman, the duck and other small birds; and the specifically Sassanian motifs of senmurv and boar's head. The beaded roundel in which so many occur is also typical, perhaps derived from those on late antique mosaics, but the more ancient Persian use of the animal frieze as a textile border survives, the animals either symmetrically confronted or proceeding in a single row.

Despite the collapse of the Sassanian Empire after the Arab invasions in the middle of the seventh century, the textile industry was hardly affected, and the animal style became that of Islamic art. The lack of an established art style of the Arab peoples led to the adoption of elements from those that they came in contact with through conquest, in all aspects of art and architecture. It was in Syria that Islamic art first developed, where, as in Egypt, the Graeco-Roman tradition survived, as opposed to the Sassanian styles of Persia and Mesopotamia; but the animal ornament was taken direct from the Sassanian style; the continuity

can be seen on textiles which can only be recognised as Islamic by a firmly associated date or Kufic inscription. (11) In fact, Persian influence tended to increase rather than decline, and in the tenth century there was a flourishing silk industry south of the Caspian employing the traditional animal motifs of the ancient Iranian world.

The rapid spread of Islam around the Mediterranean after the adoption of the art styles of west Asia resulted in their further distribution, so that a great unity prevailed, and the difference between Egyptian, Sicilian and Spanish styles was often very slight. Egypt, formerly a Byzantine province, fell to the Arabs in 641; it was one of the earliest regions to be conquered, and was a source of some influence on the Islamic style. The development of Coptic art into an early Christian style from a Graeco-Roman origin had showed increasingly Asiatic traits, particularly reflected in textile decoration where, in the fifth and sixth centuries, a transition was made from the motifs of classical art, derived from mosaics and wall paintings, to the copying of woven silk patterns of Sassanian type. (12) As a result, when the Islamic textile industry, working in a basically Sassanian style, was brought to Egypt, it was reinforced by the presence of this form of ornament already there, and the Coptic weavers continued in this manner for Moslem and Christian patrons. The Fatimid period, from the late tenth century, was a time of great artistic prosperity, and

the characteristic stone reliefs and wood carving show the confronted animal pairs and roundels of the textiles; and a distinctive group of carved oliphants with animals in friezes, pairs and roundels also illustrates the strength of this tradition. (13)

In Spain, the Byzantine orientation of the Visigothic period was destroyed by the Arab invasions of the eighth century; by 750 the Cordoban Caliphate, an offshoot of the Mesopotamian Umayyad house, was firmly established. There followed a period of prosperity and flourishing industry for Christian and Moslem alike, marked by the development of two distinct styles of art, Hispano-Moresque and Mozarabic. The Hispano-Moresque style is that of Spanish Islam, which achieved full independence after 929, when the Abbasid Caliph at Baghdad was no longer recognised. The animal style of Islamic art was retained however, and the group of ivory caskets made in Cordoba in the late tenth and early eleventh centuries (14) show the familiar range of confronted pairs, combat motifs, roundels and friezes, carved locally but finding their models in the textile ornament of Islamic Persia, Egypt and Syria, and of Spain itself, where a great industry was established; Andalusia was the first major centre, and from the tenth century silk looms existed in Almeria and several other areas. These textiles are of a less obviously Spanish nature than the caskets, and are not always easy to distinguish from the

other Islamic types. Architecture also saw the adaptation of originally Persian and Syrian forms.

The Mozarabic (Musta'rib = Arabized) style was that of the Christian communities of Spain under Arab rule; and it is particularly significant for the transmission of eastern influence to the west in that these aspects were not merely part of the style as an inevitable effect of contact, but were deliberately incorporated into Christian iconography. So that when other western, Christian styles were in contact with Mozarabic art, they were also directly in touch with the Islamic art which had contributed to its development. It is seen at its richest in manuscript illustration, especially in the late ninth and tenth century versions of the Beatus Commentary on the Apocalypse, where both general treatment and individual motifs show the amount of oriental influence; the characteristic animal subjects belong to the Iranian world, while the clear colours, flat surfaces, frontalism and linear treatment all betray the non-classical origin. The manuscripts of Leon, Galicia and Castile are characterised by animal ornament of identical pairs, combat motifs - animals confronted before a tree including griffin, senmurv and horse and rider, all belonging to the repertoire of the Sassanian textile style and its derivatives.

(15) Wall painting also reflected this style, with a particular use of Islamic motifs in secular rather than religious themes, the flat treatment and oriental fauna again

suggesting a textile source, a tradition which survived into the murals of the Romanesque period, as at S. Baudelio, Pantoon and Leon. (16) In architecture also the oriental usages of the Mozarabic litany affected the plan of the church, and the Islamic horseshoe arch and foliate decoration were incorporated. The Mozarabic style became particularly associated with the Christian kingdom of the Asturias, which had managed to retain its independence and in the tenth and eleventh centuries had many fine scriptoria. By the eleventh century, the tide of Islamic success was beginning to turn, and the orientation of the kingdom to France and Germany combined with the Cluny organisation of the Santiago de Compostela pilgrimage resulted in the spread of Islamic traits in decoration and architecture which arose from direct contact with the Mozarabic and secondary influence from the Hispano-Moresque style. (17) At the same time, Islamic Spain remained vividly a part of the east, and the luxury goods - silks, glass, metalwork and ivory - were not only made locally but also imported from Egypt, Syria and Persia, and also reached north west Europe as highly valued gifts and souvenirs.

Sicily was overrun by the Arabs in the ninth century, and from 909 was a part of the Egyptian Empire under Fatimid rule. The Norman conquest of 1061 made little difference to its industries or art styles, and the ivory caskets made in Palermo in the twelfth century (18) show a survival of the

hunting, combat and confronted animal motifs of Sassanian-Islamic type. The silk industry of Palermo in fact flourished more after the Norman occupation, with the survival of the same animal style, which is also that seen on religious and secular mosaics; it was completely adopted by the Normans. (19)

But while Islam may be described as the true heir of Sassanian art, there was also a considerable inheritance for the Christian states of east Europe and west Asia, which had their own effect on Romanesque art. The affinities between Byzantine and Persian textile design were very close, and the Sassanian animal style was adopted. It was in silks that the Byzantine weavers excelled; while there is little evidence for much Persian silk weaving before the tenth century, it had been established in Constantinople from the fourth century, and by the sixth century there was an imperial monopoly of purples and silks. While Byzantine art of the fifth and sixth centuries still showed the influence of the classical tradition, ivories and mosaics using late Antique patterns, and textile motifs of Graeco-Roman rather than Iranian type, from the seventh century it became increasingly orientalisised, and the silks of the ninth and tenth centuries show a completely Persian range of identical confronted animals in roundels, frequently before a tree, with senmurvs, winged horses, griffins, lions and elephants as characteristic animals. The two-headed eagle became an especial symbol

for the imperial house, and although it could no longer stand for the divine power of the emperor as sun-god, it still represented majesty in a Christian context. These elements were also seen in ivory carving and, to a lesser extent, manuscript illustration and some mosaic art.

The spread of the Iranian animal style by textiles into Islamic and Byzantine art had not on the whole affected stone sculpture: Islamic buildings, while using carved decoration, usually preferred geometrical, abstract or foliate designs, while Byzantine churches were built of brick, and on the whole employed mosaics as interior decoration. In contrast, the churches of Armenia and Georgia are characterised by their sculptural decoration in which animal motifs played a major part; and they are significant in any study of western Romanesque sculpture not because they had a direct or even indirect effect upon it, but because they evolved a very similar style from the same source of origin, the animal ornament of the Persian textiles. Armenia was converted to Christianity in 301, Georgia soon afterwards, and the provinces were the scene of Byzantine-Sassanian conflict until Arab occupation from the middle of the seventh century for two hundred years. In the succeeding period of the restoration of local culture and material prosperity, the architects revived some of the pre-Arab plans and styles of building, including the use of low relief sculpture to decorate parts of the facade. (20) The tenth century

church at Achtamar on Lake Van is unique in the elaboration of its surface carvings, which consist of two animal friezes encircling the church below the roof, and a rich scattering of figures over the north, south and west facades. While the human figures illustrate Old and New Testament scenes, and are derived from the iconography of the churches of the pre-Arab period, the secular scenes can be compared to Islamic and Iranian palace decoration, with animal ornament of Sassanian type, although more probably imitating textiles of Islamic date. (21) The range of animals, real and fantastic, confronted pairs, combat motifs, the details of treatment and two-dimensional effect all suggest textile prototypes; the textile industry of Armenia was known to be a highly developed one in the tenth century. Although little material remains survive, the carpets, woollens and embroidered silks of Dvin and Artashat were famous: their range of animal motifs might have inspired those of the manuscripts, where confronted animals and birds showed a further derivation of the Iranian style. (22) In woodcarving also, textiles were the obvious prototype in the use of roundels and beading, as well as the familiar range of confronted and combat motifs. (23)

A similar style is seen in many other churches in Armenia and Georgia, with traits which are also characteristic of the Romanesque animal style - lions and felines with head facing the front and body in profile, the tail curled down between

the legs and up over the back; backward-looking animals biting the tips of their tails, forepaws raised; the recurrent scenes of lions on deer, and birds swooping on their victims; horse and rider groups; the Daniel/Gilgamesh motif; birds biting at foliage; pairs confronted before the central tree. (24) In the province of Daghestan, which remained Moslem, there were particularly close Islamic contacts in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. As the whole Caucasian area had been affected from prehistoric times by the Iranian animal style, its use in this period can be seen as a kind of renaissance as a result of its adoption as Persian textile ornament, and through the influence of Islamic art - the same factors which caused its adoption in the west.

If the styles of the Caucasian area were important for preserving Sassanian art, and relating its animal style to architectural sculpture, a most curious example of survival can be seen in the carving of the churches in the Vladimir Suzdal region of south west Russia. (Pls. 47-50) The facades and tympana are scattered with sculpture in shallow relief, animals forming the main ornament, with a similar range of types, details of style and treatment as the Georgian and Armenian ones. But the dates of the churches show a considerable time-lag: the Cathedral of the Assumption, Vladimir, with masks, birds and lions on the tympanum dates from 1158, the church of the Virgin, Nerl, of 1165 has birds, lions, griffins and hares, but the area of

ornament is still restricted. With the cathedral of St. Dmitri, 1193, there is an elaboration of ornament over the facade, the flatter style of relief being replaced by more rounded forms, as at the Cathedral of the Nativity of the Virgin, Suzdal, and the Cathedral of St. George, Yureyev Polski, both dating from c. 1230, and showing the same range of animals. (25) This style of ornament does not arise out of a belated Russian variant of the west European Romanesque, although the search for a possible current of influence would be an interesting one, for the sculpture has no function. The building plans suggest an origin in the Caucasus, for they seem to be deliberate copies of the tenth and eleventh century Georgian and Armenian types, with the consequent adaptation of their sculptured decoration in the twelfth century period of consolidation in the Suzdal area. They represent a very late example of the survival of the Sassanian animal style, in a period when in the west, the Romanesque had been replaced by the Gothic.

The distinctive animal styles of the Balkans can also be ascribed to a Sassanian origin, which had various degrees of influence on both Christian and non-Christian art. It was a style which first reached south east Europe as a result of the influence of Sassanian luxury goods, jewellery, vases, plates and textiles, whose ornament was copied by the Turkish proto-Bulgar tribes of central Asiatic origin. (26) A monument ascribed to the proto-Bulgars is the treasure of Nagyzentmiklos, (27) a great hoard of gold and silver vessels,

buried in 893 during the Hungarian invasion, and showing an overwhelmingly Iranian influence, expressed in a range of Achaemenid, Sassanian and early Islamic motifs with particular Fatimid parallels; they are decorated with cult scenes, symbolic and ornamental animals. The vessels may be of diverse origin, but do illustrate the strong Persian influence that there was on Bulgarian art, which is also illustrated in the presumably locally made Terracina casket, (pls. 51, 52) a wooden box whose carved ends show a series of animal groups, particularly combat scenes, under rounded arches; while the treatment is clumsy, the choice and positions reflect a certain degree of Sassanian influence, although not a very direct one (28). The characteristic symmetry of the textile ornament is lacking, and the style is hard to define - it has been described as Coptic, Lombardic and Byzantine, styles which all incorporate details of the Persian animal style. The most plausible explanation of the casket and treasure is that they represent the eclectic animal style of the Asiatic tribes, the treasure with specifically Sassanian influence, and the casket having more Eurasiatic parallels, but both a product of the Iranian animal style. These tribes had settled in the Balkans in the seventh and eighth centuries; a further example of their animal style can be seen in the ornament of the Patleina pottery, which is completely Iranian. (29)

This tradition in Balkan art results in the distinctive

animal sculpture of the tenth and eleventh century churches (30) which, like those of Georgia and Armenia and of the Romanesque west employ the familiar motifs of lions, (Pl. 53) griffins, two-headed eagles, hunting and combat motifs, which do not develop as a result of mutual influence, but as developments from the same source of origin, the Iranian animal style seen on Sassanian textiles.

A late survival of the style can be seen in the tombstones and sarcophagi of Herzegovina, carved with hunting and combat motifs, and real and fantastic single animals associated with symbols and ornamental motifs, in the flattish relief that results from textile ornament. These carvings date from the eleventh to fourteenth century and can be related to the Manichaean cult of the Bogomils, which combined the Iranian Zoroastrian doctrine with New Testament dogma (31) Animal symbolism played some part in the cult, and the basically Persian beliefs were modified by contacts with Christianity and Islamic tradition, and the popularity of the animal decoration took on a higher significance. The style is Iranian rather than specifically Sassanian; the latest carvings, dating from the end of the fourteenth century compare with those late medieval Scottish grave slabs carved with hunting scenes as examples of an extraordinarily archaic preservation of an animal style.

The most distant example of the influence of the Persian animal style occurs in Scandinavian art, where however it is so quickly absorbed and adapted into the vigorous native animal art that it is hard to distinguish as an intrusive element. While the Norwegians and Danes were raiding west Europe, the Swedes pushed south east and established two great commercial routes, by the Dnieper and Black Sea to Byzantium, and by the Volga and Caspian to Itil and beyond. This was a trade which had started in the late eighth century, reaching a peak from the late ninth to tenth, and starting to decline in the years after 1000. (32) In return for the exported furs, timber and slaves, eastern luxury objects came to Scandinavia, in particular much decorated silverwork - rings, pendants, strap ends, plaques and so on, made in the intermediate Khazar provinces under the influence of Persian art, as well as Islamic objects, jewellery, glass, and over 20,000 Arab coins; even textiles survive. (33) The middlemen of this trade were the Moslem Turkish tribes, including Bulgars and Khazars of the lower and middle Volga, where the Arab domination of the area had led to the adoption of the Persian style. The animal ornament consists of confronted and single birds and felines, associated with trees and foliage ornament, in the characteristic positions of the Sassanian style; backward-looking, front paws raised, tail bending up between the legs, protruding tongue. It would seem inevitable that there should be some reaction to this style in Scandinavian art, although its own strong tradition of linear treatment,

interlace and unrecognisable, fragmented creatures was in complete contrast. But it is possible to recognise certain animals which, if detached from the surrounding interlace do not find a satisfactory origin in the previous course of development. The Ringerike style, dating from the late tenth century, is characterised by the use of single animals associated with the distinctive fleshy tendril ornament derived from acanthus patterns of manuscript type; some of the animals themselves are foreign, and new to Scandinavian art. There are peacocks, lions and felines, snake and deer combats, which are more characteristic of metalwork than stone sculpture, with the range of positions and details of treatment - leaf plumes on the tail, neck tufts, palmettes and shell spirals - which have oriental parallels, and can more likely be attributed to the influx of objects in the Persian style through the eastern trade routes than the result of Byzantine influence on Carolingian art. (34) These are elements which do not have a lasting effect on the style, owing to the strength of the previous style, but are of interest in showing the widespread field of influence of Persian art.

It remains to show how the Iranian animal style in Sassanian art was such an important source for western Romanesque art. A major factor is Christianity. The adoption of an eastern religion by the west resulted in the spread of eastern styles westwards by two main routes, mediterranean and continental. So that while Irish and English Christianity initially

showed Coptic and Syrian contacts, Merovingian Gaul was also in touch with Byzantium. The use of animal ornament in the early Christian cultures of the west, while influenced by the linear Germanic style and underlying Iron age traditions was at the same time inevitably affected by east Mediterranean, early Christian art - symbols deriving from the Hellenistic style and the Iranian bestiary, which was a part of all near eastern art. Also a demand was created for the luxury goods of the east, which were not necessarily connected with Christianity and had other styles of decoration, like the woven textiles. The resulting animal ornament in the west showed even in the fifth and sixth centuries motifs that were to reappear in Romanesque art as a part of the same process, and which in fact recurred throughout the intervening period, becoming adopted into the local styles and making it very difficult to determine what exactly constituted foreign influence. Ireland for example seems to have been importing Coptic objects at an early stage in the development of its Christian art style, and a motif such as the hounds leaping at the nose or on the back of a deer, which occurs in Coptic, and ultimately Eurasiatic art, (35) becomes typical of British pre-Conquest sculpture - so that its appearance in the Anglo-Norman style is a result of local and not oriental influence. Other deer and boar hunting scenes have a wide distribution and long survival in classical, Christian and Islamic art; and while of

a possible ultimately Iranian origin, cannot be regarded as evidence of direct influence.

The period from the sixth to the eighth century can be regarded as a time of Syrian influence on west Christian art, when there were close relations between France, north Italy and the east; the consequent animal ornament was not so much due to Persian or Byzantine models as to the eastern style having already been adapted and transformed through the more Hellenistic but Christian art of Syria. The inhabited vine scrolls of Northumbrian and occasionally Irish and Scottish sculpture illustrate this tradition; it is suggested that colonies of Syrians were established in France and may even have worked in England, since there are considerable differences in style between 'pure' and more obviously local differences. (36)

Pilgrimages were also important for the spreading of eastern styles to the west in the wake of Christianity. Even in the fifth century, there were two hundred monasteries and hospices around Jerusalem, (37) and the venerated relics of the early saints and martyrs were taken back, wrapped up in the woven silks which are found in their shrines in the cathedral treasuries of the west. The pilgrimage movement was affected by the Arab conquests, and by the presence of Moslem and Norse pirates in the Mediterranean, but as a result of the encouragement of Charlemagne and the increasing

political stability from the tenth century onwards, it became virtually an industry, and Cluny patronage added the moral persuasion that such a journey was essential for the good of one's soul; the travellers to Jerusalem, Santiago and other holy places in the tenth and eleventh centuries must have brought back quantities of silks, ivories and metalwork, decorated in the characteristic Persian animal style.

If Christianity is one factor by which the Iranian animal style reached the west, the second major factor is the great trade in woven silks, which may have originated as part of the spread of east Mediterranean Christianity, but once the demand had been created the supply continued, Islamic textiles coming to be as important as Byzantine and Sassanian ones. Silks were a part of the wide commerce between Merovingian Gaul and the Levant, which survived and expanded after the Arab invasions, an encouragement rather than a deterrent; while most of the silks surviving in Germany are Byzantine, those in central and southern France are Islamic. (38) There is a great amount of evidence to show the existence of ninth and tenth century silks in the west, from existing fragments, from written references - they were the standard gifts of the Islamic rulers of Persia, Africa and Spain, and also in demand by the church and nobility for use as hangings and robes - and from their use as models for ornament in other forms of art.

Carolingian art, while marked by a deliberate revival

of classical styles, was also inevitably affected by the Persian animal style, in the period of Islam's furthest expansion into Europe and through relations between the new empire and Byzantium, contacts which were made even closer in the Ottonian period. So in ivory carving, confronted pairs of animals of Persian type form a frequent ornament. (39) And while these could conceivably be copying similar, although not so frequent ornament on Byzantine ivory carving, the use of animal ornament on a number of manuscripts suggests that it had been directly copied from textile models showing the characteristic traits of Persian art. (40)

England was as much affected by the import of these silks as the continent. Even in 786, the Anglo-Saxon synods were defending the right of the clergy to wear richly coloured silks; and Charlemagne sent two pieces of silk to King Offa of the Mercians. (41) At Canterbury Cathedral, the bags covering the medieval charter seals were made of scraps of silk, showing a variety of sources: the woven and embroidered animals include confronted peacocks, griffins, horses, double headed eagles, other birds, rabbits and felines on a range of textiles dating from the eighth to eleventh centuries, of Sassanian, Islamic, Byzantine, Spanish and Khorasan work. (42) In Durham Cathedral, the silks in the shrine of St. Cuthbert show a similarly wide range and origin, (43) fragments of a robe decorated with griffins was found with the bones of William of St. Carilef, while the inventory of Ranulf Flambard's

chapel included copes with griffins and peacocks. (44)

But while the Iranian animal style reached the west on woven and embroidered silks, and served as a source of inspiration for animal ornament, some of the animals even being accepted in Christian iconography in the same manner as those of the classical bestiaries and fables, it was not, before the Romanesque period, very important as a source for stone sculpture. And so the third main factor for its importance in Romanesque art is the eleventh century development of architectural sculpture and the popularity of animal motifs as decoration. The reasons for this are not easy to determine, and there would seem to be several causes. A direct revival of Gallo-Roman sculpture, as is sometimes claimed (45) overstates the case, although some classical influence may be admitted particularly in the south of France. The development of architecture contributed to the ornament used to decorate it; the volute and cushion capitals of the early Romanesque style supplied smooth, blank surfaces for decoration, as did the rounded arches over doors and windows. The pilgrimage churches contributed to the rapid extension and development of architecture and decoration; some influence must be admitted from Islamic Spain in the use of carved ornament and stucco, while the Mozarabic manuscript style was important for the iconography of southern French sculpture in the use of scenes from the Beatus manuscripts, while their integral animal ornament was also adopted. The

influence of manuscript art on sculpture was a significant one, for it provided a range of accepted symbols and motifs and, by its portable nature, made possible the widespread style of models. It also ensured the association of purely ornamental motifs with a Christian style, for the manuscript artists were monks, although the sculptors may not have been, and the acceptance of the range of confronted animals as suitable for church sculpture partly stems from their use as manuscript decoration, copied from the patterns of the woven silks of eastern origin associated with shrines and relics. Manuscript art is not necessarily always the intermediate stage between textile and sculpture decoration, but it must have been a frequent one. The spread of carved ornament in the Anglo-Norman style however seems on the whole to result from the copying of other sculptures; and one reason for this is the great extension of stone church building as a result of the Norman Conquest.

The use of animals as a subject for carving is seen sporadically through the pre-Romanesque period, as a result of oriental influence, on plaques and sarcophagi, and very occasional architectural examples; a general revival of sculpture in the years after 1000 led to the increased and automatic use of the animal ornament which was already an accepted part of manuscript, ivory and mosaic art; (46) the sporadic examples of animal ornament on stone carving from the Merovingian period onwards can be attributed to the Byzantine-

Persian world as a source of inspiration. The use of animals for church decoration rose partly from their iconographical significance, as in the moralising aspect of the fables and bestiaries, which were sometimes illustrated in stone; and from a more general symbolic role, one which was not necessarily related to Christianity. But the popularity of the confronted pairs in a range of types and positions is a mainly ornamental one, and derives from the ornament of the Persian silks.

B. The Effect on Anglo-Norman Art

There were a considerable number of specific animal motifs in the Anglo-Norman style which can be related to the general background of the Iranian animal style and its survival in Sassanian textile ornament, the Tapestry having rather more elements in common with it than the sculpture group. In fact, the design of the Tapestry in its use of narrow borders filled with animals is strongly influenced by the textile style; in Sassanian and Byzantine silks, the pairs of animals are often surrounded by narrow border strips containing further small animals (47), while straight borders are often used as the edge of a piece of material, and the prototype of the Tapestry is found in the narrow strips of linen, with the central portion plain and the upper and lower borders filled with confronted and adorsed pairs of animals originating

in Islamic Egypt. (e.g. Pl. 54) The areas to be decorated by sculpture however do not lend themselves so well to this sort of frieze treatment; only at Wroxeter and Stottesdon are there three creatures in a row, although they do represent three birds and three felines respectively, a confronted pair and a third one, which are the most typical of the Tapestry pairs. The placing of animals in roundels occurs sporadically in the sculpture group, and not at all on the Tapestry; it had been a characteristic feature of the Persian style, but by the tenth century was being replaced by a plain border row of animals. (48)

The placing of a tree between the confronted pairs, reflected in the Tapestry by the delicate sprigs of foliage which are derived from Anglo-Saxon manuscript drawing, is a motif which dates from the fourth millennium; the Tree of Life symbolises deity in Sumerian art, and its guardian animals remain constant in Iranian art. This motif is adapted in Christian art, (49) where the tree can be replaced by a vase, fountain or cross, as at Beckford or Emley. The tree survived as an aspect of Persian sun symbolism, and passes into the Byzantine textile style, where a group of tenth century woven silks show fidelity to the earlier iconography in the use of various solar symbols, including the Tree with confronted animals. (50)

In contrast to the otherwise basically realistic treatment

of the Anglo-Norman style, there are a few pairs of animals which are only represented by their upper half. The source can perhaps be traced to a group of Persian textiles whose decoration consists of addorsed and confronted rows of, most frequently, horses or lions which are only shown by the upper part of the body. These are copied from Persian and Byzantine animal capitals and Sassanian seals, ultimately deriving from the addorsed animal protomes of Iranian solar and lunar symbols seen in the columns of Susa, and second millennium seals. (51) The head and neck of the animal which can be shown with or without forelegs reflect the duality of the early Byzantine capital tradition; this is also seen in the Anglo-Norman group - at Everton the heads alone are shown, while at Cricklade and Barton Segrave the forelegs are added. It is interesting that while the latter pair are goats, the other two have both qualities of horse or lion about them, and that this composite type of creature does not occur elsewhere in the group.

Another pair only shown by the head are the felines at Ampney St. Mary, whose necks are coiled around the large mask-like faces (Pl. 5). While the actual treatment of these seems inspired by Scandinavian carving, the use of a confronted pair is not; but a close parallel to the group occurs on a ninth century Byzantine silk, the Suaire of St. Victor, Sens, (52) where a Gilgamesh/Daniel figure with confronted lions is shown with his feet on another pair, illustrated only by their heads, with clearly indicated facial features and paws which are coiled

up around the heads to claw at the man's feet. Above the Ampney pair are a confronted lion and griffin, but they use the feline masks as a base line very much in the manner of the silk.

The motif at Aldbrough-in-Holderness of the confronted backward looking hinds, one with a leafy branch in its mouth and its baby suckling it, is unique in the Anglo-Norman group, but can be seen on an eighth century Syrian or Umayyad silk, (53). While this motif does not belong to the repertoire of Iranian art, and seems, in its attractive naturalism to come from a more Hellenistic tradition, its use in a woven silk as a pair confronted before a tree means that such a source could exist for the Aldbrough carving. The hind and young on the Gallehus horns and on the Pictish St. Vigean's I stone lack the attributes of backward looking head, and branch in the mouth, and they do not belong to a pair; but the latter example is associated with a dromedary, a not uncommon textile subject (54), as if the whole stone shared the exotic influences behind the Anglo-Norman carving.

The strange confronted pair at Stratton, with the bodies of felines, and human heads turned to the front, one of which is wearing a crown, find a possible prototype in an Islamic motif; for example, on the tenth century Fatimid 'Veil of St. Anne', Vaucluse, (55), are an adorsed pair, with the tails pointing upwards and entwined, forming a tree-like central focus. The bodies are feline, and have the front paw raised, but the

faces are human and wear a distinctive pointed crown. That the crowned head is an interchangeable attribute, and not confined to one type of animal is suggested by its use on a siren of the bird type on an Armenian manuscript (56).

The wheel-like symbol which is associated with the carvings at Whitwell, Llanbadarn Fawr and Ridlington is an intrusive element and not a part of the design of the confronted pair. The two latter rosettes each have eight petals, and are placed beneath the front legs of one of the animals, at Ridlington the lion, and Llanbadarn Fawr the feline on the left. At Whitwell there are three rosettes, with the feline between two of them, and they have five, six and eight petals respectively. An eight-pointed rosette was a part of sun symbolism in Mesopotamian art, as a mark of royalty or divinity, and when associated with animals could signify their immortality. (57) The simplest form, as a cross or swastika, could be used on the haunch of an animal to mark the joint, in the same manner as the Celtic spiral. The rosette motif survived into Sassanian architecture and metalwork, passing also into Syria and Egypt, from where it was adopted into Christian art as a sacred symbol: it is this aspect that is seen at Egleton, where feline and dragon confront a large central eight-petalled rosette which has the same significance as the cross, tree or Agnus Dei. (The central scallop shell at Ideford has undergone the same

alteration into a Christian symbol.) But the smaller rosettes on the other carvings seem to be an attribute of the associated felines in the way that the haunch rosette stands for the strength and divinity of the Achaemenid and Sassanian lions, and is often depicted on the woven silks. A survival of the haunch rosette into the Romanesque period can be seen in a group of mosaics in France and Italy, once thought to be Merovingian but now accepted as late eleventh to twelfth century (an example of the curious parallels between styles when influenced by the same sources). (58) The Persian origin of the style can be seen in the placing of animals in medallions, various ornamental details, and the choice and position of the animals shown; two of the lions, at Thiers and Reggio Emilia, have the haunch rosette. It is possible that such mosaics, found in churches, were copying the actual altar carpet or wall hanging, which itself might have been a woven silk. Although the Anglo-Norman carvings do not have the rosette on the haunch, its particular association with the lion and feline is undeniable.

Apart from these specific examples of motifs transmitted through textile influence, a whole range of animals in Romanesque art have eastern rather than western origins, (59) a fact which applies to the majority of those of the Anglo-Norman style, although the animals themselves have frequently been adapted into and recognised by the Christian iconography. The lion (and maneless feline) is the most recurrent among the

confronted pairs in sculpture and the second most frequent on the Tapestry. Its role in medieval Christian symbolism was a dual one, representing both the Incarnation and the Resurrection, combined with the more general virtues of courage and vigilance; (60) but the Anglo-Norman sculptor and congregation were not necessarily aware of this interpretation - it was merely the most accepted form of animal ornament. Its significance in Iranian art was as a destroying and devouring power, symbolising life transcending death; it is this aspect that is stressed in the Achaemenid and Sassanian royal hunting scenes, for the king killing or taming the lion becomes himself a source of divine life. The lion hunting scene is a common one on the textiles, and confronted pairs of lions are particularly characteristic of a tenth century Byzantine Imperial group, with examples still surviving in the treasuries of Maestricht, Siegburg and Chinon. (61) The Anglo-Norman lions share their details of treatment: the head turned to the front, the further front paw raised, the tail between the hind legs and up over the back, often ending in a leaf-shaped tip.

The predatory, devouring nature of the lion is shown at Barton Segrave, where the lion on the left has a human head in its jaws; Psalm 22 says 'Salva me de ore leonis', and Hell or Satan may be represented by the lion's jaws. (The centaur at Kencott fires his arrow into a large feline head, while that at Beckford might be the head of dragon or feline.) At

Judgement Day, monsters will vomit back their human victims, and it is probably this aspect that is illustrated in the Romanesque carvings of limbs protruding from lions' and other animals' mouths (62). The motif of the lion leaping on to an animal victim, generally deer or ibex also illustrates this predatory nature. It originates in Sumerian art, and remains constant in the Iranian style, being rapidly assimilated into Islamic art (63), and frequent as a textile motif. The lion and deer combat on the Tapestry (B 16) does not have an exact parallel in any of the textile designs, as the struggle generally shows the lion leaping on top of the deer, and not crouched upon the ground as in this example; it would seem to result from the designer creating his own version of the motif.

Another aspect of lion symbolism is the theme of Daniel in the lion's den, which is often expressed in Romanesque art by a central human figure between a confronted pair of felines. This motif is of very much greater antiquity than the early Christian period, and can be used to represent the ascent of Alexander (cf. Charney Basset), Thecla, Menas and the Good Shepherd, as well as Daniel, which is merely a late variant. (64) The source lies in the Mesopotamian epic of Gilgamesh, where the hero is regarded as the master of the animals which he has dominated. The animals are not necessarily lions, and originally represented those of the solar divinities; their variety is

illustrated in the Luristan bronzes, where several different types occur, the upside-down position indicating total submission, which sometimes recurs in the Daniel subjects. The Merovingian and Romanesque scenes sometimes show the animals actually attacking and overcoming the central human figure - at Leckhampstead and Ribbesford, the small humans are very much the prey of the confronted creatures, neither of which are lions. The scene does occur in the woven Persian textiles, although its use in the Romanesque period also arises from the earlier adoption of the theme into Christian art, and cannot be regarded as an example of direct eastern influence.

Further versions can be seen in the use of the human mask between confronted animals, lions at Barton Segrave, dragons at Much Wenlock and birds at Bramber, a motif already present in the pre-Conquest sculpture styles of Britain, but deriving from an ultimately Iranian type and reaching West Europe through Merovingian art as a result of Eurasiatic influence. The common Iranian source may be seen by its survival in Islamic art (65). A different version is the scene of Christ trampling on the asp and basilisk, at Jevington shown as a feline and a snake in the Scandinavian style, but derived from the Carolingian motif, which is itself ultimately inspired by the scenes of Daniel shown standing on top of two animals, as in the Byzantine *Suaire de St. Victoire* type, which might have contributed to

the Ampney St. Mary lions.

The lion at Stoke-sub-Hamden labelled 'Leo' shows its role as one of the signs of the Zodiac, which are illustrated in the calendar books derived from a classical source; later in the Romanesque period these were used as models for a whole scheme of carving. The centaurs are from the same source; in the sculpture group, they hold bows and those at Kencott and Stoke-sub-Hamden (and the font at Hook Norton) have the inscription 'Sagittarius'. The one at Ault Hucknall however holds a branch, like many of the Scottish and Irish carved ones - these may all be derived from a manuscript drawing, for this version often stands for the healing power of the centaur Chiron.

(66) The original significance of the branch was as an attribute of the centaur in Greek art of the Geometric period, when it represented a pine tree and was used as a weapon in the combat with the lapiths. (67) Although characteristic of the art of the classical period which, through the use of the motif in sculpture and mosaic, was the main source for its survival into Romanesque art, it first occurs as a composite monster in the art of Babylon. By Assyrian times, it had developed a zodiac significance, and was shown holding a bow between Scorpio and Capricorn. This Sagittarius aspect was influenced in the Romanesque period by the mounted, bow-shooting king of Persian art, characterised by his backward-looking position to fire over his shoulder, a motif common in Sassanian art on all hunting scenes in stone, metalwork or textile, and

surviving on the woven silks as confronted pairs of horsemen. This position is faithfully copied in the Anglo-Norman group at Stoke-sub-Hamden and Salford, although in the latter case it means that the bow is actually being pointed away from the lion.

Another human composite monster of primarily classical origin is the mermaid. A fish-tailed monster is first seen in Babylonian cylinder seals of the third millennium, passing into Syrian art where it was worshipped as a female deity, and then into Greek art in the period of oriental influence. It was common in Roman mosaic and sculpture as a female triton, and reached Christian art through the Physiologus, in particular the eighth century Liber Monstrorum, which had great influence on the spread of the motif into other manuscripts, and especially the bestiaries, where it was regarded as a symbol of evil. (68) The raised arms and long hair of the Anglo-Norman types are Romanesque attributes; the double-tailed mermaid which is seen at Little Langford, while possibly derived from the Scottish carved type finds an earlier prototype at Cividale, (69) resulting from Byzantine influence. The mermaid does not appear in Sassanian art, although the other type of siren, with the body of a bird, does occur in the Islamic period; and it is not characteristic of any style of textile decoration. It is perhaps significant that this motif is not used on the Tapestry borders at all, although appearing in sculpture several times in its bestiary role; and similarly the rather unusual

Tapestry centaurs are in no way characteristic of its ornament, and are more likely to be derived from a manuscript source.

Griffins were common as textile ornament, and appear in the Anglo-Norman style on the Tapestry and in sculpture. The variety amongst the Tapestry examples reflects the duality of its origin, for the lion or eagle element can predominate more than the other. It seems to have evolved from Sumerian composite types such as the winged lion, or lion-headed eagle, reaching its present form fairly late in the development of Iranian art, where it was regarded as a solar symbol. It was a characteristic motif in Achaemenid and Sassanian art, occurring in relief carving, metalwork and textile ornament, singly, as a confronted pair or leaping on its prey in the manner of the lion. In Christian symbolism it had some kind of tutelary significance, being used in Byzantine mosaics and sarcophagi in association with the Tree of life or fountain; and its frequency in Coptic, Sassanian and Byzantine textiles resulted in its popularity in Romanesque art. (70) It is less frequent in the Anglo-Norman style in the sculpture group - at Ampney and Ridlington it confronts a lion, and at Milborne Port it is shown in combat with a warrior. These carvings show the same variety in the amount of lion/eagle influence as those of the Tapestry borders.

Although confronted pairs of birds play the greatest part

in the Tapestry border ornament, they are, with one or two exceptions, not apparently intended to represent individual types. In sculpture also, the majority retain this anonymous quality. Small birds, sometimes plucking at leaves, with one or both wings raised or with head looking backwards are frequent ornamental motifs in east Mediterranean art in the early Christian period. In treatment, they closely resemble those of the border, which are patently influenced by textile prototypes. Rows of small birds frequently form the borders of the medallions containing larger confronted pairs in Sassanian and Byzantine textiles and other styles influenced by them. (71) A curious motif which appears twice in the Anglo-Norman group is that of three small birds perched in a tree: at Little Langford, all three birds turn to the left, at Stoke-sub-Hamden, the two outer birds turn in towards the central one. This position is that seen on an eleventh century Mozarabic manuscript (fig. 9a); in the carvings, the association with cleric and Agnus Dei respectively seems to give the birds a religious meaning - possibly the Trinity is symbolised - but an ornamental manuscript source is a possible one. The placing of other birds in medallions, as at St. Bees, Little Bytham and Alne, perhaps reflects their frequent textile placing in roundels.

Among recognisable Anglo-Norman birds is the eagle. It was important in the Iranian style as a solar symbol, surviving

into Sassanian art as an attribute of the king, and was common in Byzantine and Persian textile ornament. There were three main eagle types in Romanesque art (72): standing with both wings extended and the head in profile; the same position, but bicephalous; and swooping on prey, which can be of different kinds. The first type occurs at Acton and possibly, Alveston, although the now obliterated head makes it impossible to determine which type was intended. This standing position is particularly characteristic of a tenth century Imperial Byzantine group of silks (see note 61) and also survives in Islamic art from its Sassanian origin. The bicephalous eagle also common on woven silks, is used in French Romanesque carving, but is not so far known in the Anglo-Norman group. The third type, the eagle with prey, is of such antiquity and widespread distribution, reaching west Europe through the art of the Romans, and again in the early migration period, that its use in Anglo-Norman art could result from this earlier local tradition as well as from its use in styles influenced by Persian art. There is considerable variety in type; the eagle may be shown in profile or facing the front, flying standing or crouching; the prey may be held below or beside the bird, and may be gripped by claws or beak, and it can be a fish, bird or small quadruped, small deer or hare. Despite the variations possible, it can be regarded as one motif, interpreted in Christian art as Christ

saving the elect. Of ultimate Mesopotamian origin, the motif remained in Iranian art and reached the west in the migration period, having already been adopted into Roman art as a result of Sarmatian influence; it also survived into Islamic art from Sassanian influence. (73) All these aspects are seen in the Anglo-Norman style. The capital at Ribbesford shows the large bird preying on the smaller one, a motif seen later in the Hereford school at Aston, while the fish above and below the motif suggest further variations. (74) On the Tapestry, one pair of the birds are showing biting at small fish (B 109, 110) while at B 174 a bird swoops on to a hare.

The snake, which appears sporadically in the Anglo-Norman group, is the result of Scandinavian influence in a few examples and they stand for evil in Christian iconography. But the snakes at Parwich which are being trampled upon by the deer and Agnus Dei are the result of a more ancient symbolism. In the Bestiaries the deer and snake were regarded as natural enemies; a study of this motif has shown that the classical writers were influenced by an originally Indian legend of a snake-eating quadruped. (75) The motif was also adopted into Iranian art, surviving through into the Islamic style. Other examples of the snake show it associated with the central Tree, as at Stratton and Swarkestone, which can be related to the Fall, but at the same time it was a Sassanian motif, occurring in metalwork and textile. (76)

The role of the deer in Christian symbolism was linked with baptism, through its alleged association with water. ("As pants the hart for cooling streams".) But it was also important in the hunting scenes that were frequently carved on sarcophagi and came to represent hope for immortality. In Celtic mythology also the deer hunt was of some importance, and the many carved hunting scenes on the Irish and Scottish crosses combine pagan and Christian tradition. While some of the Anglo-Norman carvings can be attributed to the influence of these local styles, many hunt scenes in Romanesque art are due to other factors. The scene of the king hunting deer, boar or lion was of more than mere narrative significance in Sassanian art, but celebrated his divinity; and aspects of the hunting scene recur in the styles influenced by Sassanian art, especially that of Islam. A very interesting group is seen in the central panel of the Tapestry, the scene towards the beginning when Harold is shown first setting out for the coast; he is riding, carrying his hawk, and in front of him run three hounds which are placed one above the other, an oriental type of perspective, contrasting with the complicated and more realistic depiction of the groups of horses. Before the hounds run two very much smaller quadrupeds, whose legs are too long and ears not long enough to be convincingly described as rabbits. This scene compares very closely with an early twelfth century Spanish wall painting at St. Baudelio de Berlanga. (Fig. 9b) Specific points in

common are that the upper dog is slightly smaller than the other two, and the two pursued animals are placed in front of the two lower dogs respectively; both groups of dogs have a stiff-legged running posture, bodies which are at their broadest where the front legs join them; the prey have more rounded heads and flattened ears. The treatment is also extended to the dogs in the border hunting scene B 14. The Spanish wall painting is indebted to Mozarabic art in the use of a non-religious motif and the particularly flat impression acquired by the use of colour (79); it is probably copying a manuscript illustration, and a similar source is possible for the scene on the Tapestry.

The symbolism of the horse in Iranian art was related to that of the deer, both having associations with immortality; but it is not particularly characteristic of Sassanian art, except the variant form with wings which is seen on the Tapestry pair A 174, 175 and is common on the woven silks. (78) The horse and rider was a frequent motif in pre-Conquest sculpture, and the Anglo-Norman mounted huntsmen in the Tapestry (B 27) and at Kedleston and Tutbury probably derive from this tradition. But the confronted pair at Whippingham are perhaps influenced by a textile, for this was a not infrequent motif in the Persian style, developing as one aspect of the hunting scene, and backward-looking riders are shown shooting arrows in the position that was

to be adopted by many Romanesque centaurs. The single horse and rider was popular in Merovingian art as a result of Sarmatian influence, representing a 'cavalier hero' of some kind of tutelary significance; while, derived from the same ultimate Iranian type, the motif became associated with Christianity in Coptic art on amulets, gravestones and textiles, while the horseman with a lance, also common in Roman art, had some influence on the later iconography of St. George and the dragon. (79)

The spearing position is also that of the mounted king killing the lion, which is seen on the woven silks, and which must have some influence on the St. Michael and dragon carvings of the Anglo-Norman group. (80)

Like the winged horses, the dromedary appears only on the Tapestry, and not in the Anglo-Norman sculpture group. The confronted dromedaries at A 48, 49 are convincingly drawn, and resemble those which were an accepted border ornament for Persian textiles. (81)

Another Tapestry type is the creature with the head, body and wings of a bird but the forepaws of an animal, the pairs A 143, 144 and A 150, 151; it might be the Anglo-Norman version of a *senmurv*, a cross between dog and peacock originating in remote Iranian solar symbolism, and achieving a specific form in Sassanian art, where it was a favourite motif for textile, metalwork, stucco and stone sculpture and was regarded as of beneficial aspect. (82)

The motifs B 188, 189 of the foxes running off with goose

and hen respectively might seem in the context of the Tapestry to look like illustrations to a fable; but this was an independent motif which is first seen in Sassanian art, then reaches the Mozarabic style where it occurs in manuscript drawing (figs. 9c, 9d) and forms in this way a probable source for the Tapestry ornament. (83)

The enigmatic scene in the border at B 45, below Harold rescuing the soldiers from the quicksand, of eels, and a man lying on his side being tugged by a chain of animals has been interpreted as a group of constellations or a scene from Beowulf. It blends a number of elements although it seems relevant to Harold's situation at this point. There are several motifs which might have contributed to this scene, although they cannot be very plausibly combined. The link lies in the recumbent human figure. In some of the Antinoe textiles - a group found in an Egyptian burial ground dating from the fifth and sixth centuries, showing a blend of Greek and Sassanian elements - human figures derived from the earlier swimming children motifs of Greek and Egyptian origin are shown in a recumbent position sometimes alternating with two or three dogs which are so close together that they seem to be biting at each other and at the human in the manner of the Tapestry animals. (84) On the carved Islamic oliphants animals are sometimes placed in horizontal rows biting at the

limbs of the one in front; the animals here are of different types, such as deer, feline, griffin, rabbit and bird, not too unlike the Tapestry row of wolf, bird, feline and centaur.

(85) A human figure lying in the water with fishes around is used in Islamic art to illustrate the discovery of Shirin bathing, (86) and although apparently of too late date to influence the Anglo-Norman style, it might be a version of a much earlier motif. A shoal of eels can be seen on the Gallehus horns. (Fig. 8f) With all these possible sources, the border scene must represent the creation of the designer, combining motifs which seem to refer to the scene in the narrative panel above.

As well as the specific parallels with eastern art in the choice of animal motifs, there are also several details of treatment which show the incorporation of eastern elements. The use of the protruding tongue is recurrent feature of many of the animals on the Tapestry borders and in the sculpture group, such as the horse-lions of Everton, the feline and dragon at Newton in Cleveland, the monsters at Leckhampstead and Alveston, the dragons at Dinton, Netherton and Northampton and the lions at Milborne Port. It seems to be a particular attribute of aggression, and is generally on a symbol of evil. At Fritwell the tongues of the monsters turn into leafy branches, and form the top of the central tree, while at Dumbleton three sprigs of foliage extend from the mouth of the animal mask.

The motif of the protruding tongue originates in Egyptian art as an attribute of the god Bes, and passes into Greek and Indian art where the foliage tongue aspect was developed; in Asiatic art it tended to stand for suppliance for water, but in the east Mediterranean it was adopted in Christian art as a symbol of evil. From Byzantine, it reached Italian and Mozarabic art, and so passed into the Romanesque style. (87)

The backward-turned head is typical of the Anglo-Norman animal style; the mouth is frequently open and bites at the tip of the tail. This attitude originated on the solar animals of Iranian art, the lion, eagle and griffin, symbolising perhaps religious awe and respect, and reached Merovingian art as a result of Sarmatian influence. (88) While here it was applied to the more unrecognisable creatures of Merovingian type, it was more effectively used on the realistic animals of the Persian textile style, where the backward-turned head added complexity and unity to rows of confronted or addorsed pairs, the same effect which is obtained with many of the border animals. Another head position is the forward facing head of the lions on Sassanian and Byzantine textiles which is common in the Anglo-Norman style; and the sideways angle of the heads of the lions at Cambridge and, to a lesser extent, one at Netheravon can also be seen in the textile style. (89)

The most characteristic trait of the Anglo-Norman lions

and felines is that of the tail bending down between the hind legs and up over the back. It is the Romanesque version of a motif originating in the lions of the east; the tail curving down between the legs and under the body occurs in Achaemenid art, and from the Sassanian period extending over the back. The motif occurs in the Persian and Byzantine textile style, although it is not particularly characteristic. The greatest popularity seems to be in the Romanesque period, where it is well suited to the ornamental symmetry.

The animal tail which ends in the head of another animal is typical of the Eurasiatic style, where such animal synthesis was a frequent element. The idea of combining two forms to give a double significance is a very Iranian one; the classical chimaera is an interpretation of the Persian feline with a tail which ends in a biting head, a double monster. The motif occurs in Sassanian influenced styles, including textiles (90) and is in this way a possible source of origin for those of the Anglo-Norman group: the quadrupeds at Kensworth and Great Salkeld have tails ending in snake-like heads, as have the dragons at Newton in Cleveland, Much Wenlock and St. Bees, and those on the Tapestry at A 59, 60 and B 28, 29. A variant on this is the tail-biting feline at Stoney Stanton whose front paw ends in a head which is biting at the cleric and lion before him, and therefore is a strong symbol of evil.

Another Sassanian detail of treatment in the Anglo-Norman style is the way in which the wings of bird, griffin, dragon or horse can be shown as if attached directly to the legs, whose extended outline turns into the outline of the wing, a feature more characteristic of the Tapestry than the carved animals. This is a trait which can be seen in many examples of Sassanian metalwork and textile patterns. (91) And a similar feature on the border animals is the way in which the limbs are clearly separated from the rest of the body by heavy lines in a different colour. This is a device much used by tenth and eleventh century Mozarabic artists, and can be seen in both manuscripts and wall painting. (92) When a confronted pair are shown with one front leg raised, it is always the off-fore leg, which is the position in the Persian style.

A final Sassanian aspect in the Tapestry which is not animal ornament is however interesting to notice. In the central section, there are two scenes which show respectively Edward and William (Harold is significantly not shown like this) sitting in majesty on their thrones. Edward holds a mace, William a sword, and attendant figures stand behind both. The 'audience' scene is a frequent one in Sassanian art, being particularly popular on silverware, and demonstrating the king's enthronement, power and dignity. The attitude of the raised hand with bent fore-finger was a sign of respect in Sassanian art, and is shown in the audience scenes: this is

the attitude illustrated on the Tapestry on both Edward's and William's followers, as are the Sassanian traits of the frontal position of the king with widespread knees, the steps leading to the throne, and the throne itself which is supported by animal figures. It is possible that the designer had seen such a plate, that he should be aware of all the details of the scene; or a possible intermediary is suggested (93) in elements of French church decoration: for example, the frescoes at St. Germigny-des-Pres, Orleans, which have such an audience scene, and where the church is in fact built on the plan of a fire temple. There is nothing quite so direct in Anglo-Norman architecture, but the carved animal decoration does illustrate the survival of the Iranian animal style through the influence of Persian art; and the embroidered decoration of the Tapestry borders shows the particular source by which this type of animal ornament reached the west.

Summary

The animal art of Persia under the Sassanian dynasty is derived from the ancient Iranian style, characterised by the heraldic treatment of animals of symbolic significance. The Sassanian style, and particularly the animal ornament of its textiles, had a great deal of influence on other styles, especially on Islamic art, but also Byzantine silk weaving and Armenian and Georgian stone sculpture. Persian animal ornament was a recurrent source of influence on the art of the west, through its use to decorate portable luxury goods, in particular the woven textiles which reached the west in association with the relics of early saints and through the great trade which developed. The Arab occupation of Spain was also significant, for Islamic elements were incorporated directly into the Christian Mozarabic style.

While the influence of the Sassanian-derived animal ornamented textiles is seen in western art long before the Romanesque period, it was not until this period that they became a major source for architectural sculpture, either directly or through the medium of manuscript illustration. Many aspects of the Anglo-Norman animal style show this influence, in the popularity of the confronted pair, the range of types and various details of treatment. The animals of the Tapestry have more Persian elements about them, because they are used as textile ornament like their

prototypes; the carved animals are further removed from this source, but the Iranian animal style as preserved in Sassanian textile ornament is still a vitally important factor, as it is for the rest of Romanesque animal sculpture.

Conclusions

It is valid to speak of an Anglo-Norman animal style, rather than just a use of animal motifs in Anglo-Norman art, diverse though they may be. There are a number of recurrent features in the sculpture group which are confirmed by those in the Tapestry borders as being characteristic of the style: the use of confronted pairs of animals in a particular range of types and positions. This form of animal ornament is typical of Romanesque art; what gives the English style its distinctive quality can be seen in the points of divergence between the carved and embroidered animals, reflecting their varied origins.

For amongst the carved animals there are certain details which find their closest parallels in the stone sculpture of Ireland, Scotland, Man and north England in the period of Viking influence. Animal motifs played an important part in all these styles, which developed from varying combinations of underlying Iron Age traditions with the influence of early Christian art from the east Mediterranean world. That these motifs survived to be incorporated into Anglo-Norman art can be mainly attributed to the Viking occupation of Britain and their adoption of local styles, particularly in respect of animal ornament. By the time of the Norman Conquest there was a strong Scandinavian element in the population of England, who

contributed to Anglo-Norman sculpture both by their version of the local pre-Conquest animal styles, and their own distinctive type of animal ornament.

This kind of influence is completely lacking in the animal ornament of the Tapestry borders; but while sharing the range of confronted types with the sculpture group, which forms the greater part of their ornament, they are also characterised by an aspect lacking in the carved animals, the copying of a whole system of manuscript derived decoration. This is to become typical of later English Romanesque sculpture, where the carvings of a doorway or capitals may represent a whole zodiac or bestiary, but in the transitional stage which is the Anglo-Norman style, there are no more than sporadic examples of this. The significance of the Tapestry border ornament, as well as its early date, is that the choice of animal motifs shows the strength of eastern models at this period, which a study of the individual details reinforces. The borders show the influence of this tradition more directly than the carved animals, which are a modified and sometimes misunderstood adaption.

The continuity of the Iranian animal style in the east is proved by its survival in Sassanian art and its derivatives; and its effect on the art of the west can be seen from the migration period onwards. Its most frequent means of transmission was as a decoration of the Persian textiles which became particularly important as a source for sculptural ornament in the Romanesque

period, and Iranian solar symbols became accepted into Christian iconography.

The duality of origin of the Anglo-Norman animal style is reflected in the differences between the carved and embroidered animals, differences which anyway must exist, since the carving of village churches was essentially a local matter, and while a few may have been directly influenced by a manuscript or textile source, it is most likely that the majority were influenced by other carvings; the range of animals and motifs may be exotic, but the treatment is essentially local, a suitable type of ornament to decorate the parish church. The Tapestry on the other hand, although intended for a church, is a courtly piece of work, especially commissioned to commemorate a great event and designed by a highly skilled artist, who chose animal motifs as the most acceptable form of border ornament. Those which compare most closely with the carved animals show the influence of the Persian style of the woven silks; the divergent aspects are the border fables, derived from an ultimately classical and more immediately Saxon manuscript style, and those carved animal groups, types and details of treatment which show the survival of certain Celtic and Germanic Iron Age aspects, together with the influence of early Christian art, both of which were already affected by Iranian animal art. These are the origins of the animal style in English Romanesque art; the Anglo-Norman style represents the first phase which, in the years after 1120, tended to

replace the distinctive animal style by the use of animal forms as ornament, and no longer as a self-contained subject in its own right.